DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 348 RC 012 581

AUTHOR Winterdyk, John Albert
TITLE A Wilderness Adventure Program as an Alternative for Juvenile Probationers: An Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services, Toronto.
PUB DATE Sep 80
NOTE 321p.: M.A. Thesis, Simon Fraser University.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; *Adventure Education; Attitude Change; *Delinquency Prevention; *Delinquent Rehabilitation; *Evaluation Methods; Males; Outdoor Education; Parent Attitudes; Personality Measures; Pretests Posttests; Probationary Period; *Program Evaluation; Recidivism; Research Methodology; Self Concept; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Student Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Jesness Inventory; Ontario; Piers Harris Childrens Self Concept Scale; Program ACTION; *Wilderness Education Programs

ABSTRACT

A true experimental design with 60 male probationers, ages 13-16, was used to evaluate the viability of an Ontario-based 21-day wilderness adventure program as an alternative for adjudicated juveniles placed on probation. Participants were randomly assigned to a control group and an experimental group. The experimental group was subdivided into 3 groups of 10 boys. The groups were matched on age, sex, frequency of prior offense, and various background characteristics. The Jesness Inventory and an adapted Piers-Harris Self-Esteem Measure were used in pre, post, and follow-up tests. Self-report data on recidivism, background characteristics, and behavioral and attitudinal changes were gathered from both groups. The three experimental groups were also evaluated by the staff. Data did not indicate a significant relationship between exposure to the program and subsequent attitudinal or behavioral changes. A noticeable, but not significant, difference was that the offenses committed by the recidivists tended to be fewer and of a less severe type for the experimental groups. Staff and parent reports recommended using the program as a supplement to probation, introducing a process evaluation, improving referral and screening procedures, and implementing some form of post structure for juveniles after they complete such a course. Appendixes include tests, evaluations, contracts, form letters, activity outlines, sample schedules, questionnaires, follow-up surveys, testing procedures, and written responses from parents. (CM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED200348

A WILDERNESS ADVENTURE PROGRAM AS AN ALTERNATIVE FOR JUVENILE PROBATIONERS: AN EVALUATION

by

John Albert Winterdyk

B.A. (Honours), Wilfrid Laurier University 1978

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS
in the Department
of
Criminology

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

© John Albert Winterdyk 1980

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

September 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John Winterdyk

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

All rights reserved. This work may not be
reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy
or other means, without permission of the author.

RC 012581

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPROVAL

Name: John Albert Winterdyk

Degree: Master of Arts

Title of a thesis: A Wilderness Adventure Program As an Alternative for Juvenile Probationers: An Evaluation

Examining Committee:

Paul J. Brantingham

Dr. Paul J. Brantingham
Chairperson:
Associate Professor Criminology

Ronald Roesch

Dr. Ronald M. Roesch
Senior Supervisor
Associate Professor Criminology
and Psychology

Curt T. Griffiths

Dr. Curt T. Griffiths
Assistant Professor Criminology

Wm. Hughes

Mr. William Hughes
External Examiner
Director D.A.S.H. Programme
Ministry of Attorney General
British Columbia

Date Approved: October 30, 1980

4
RECEIVED

ABSTRACT

This study involved an evaluation of an Ontario based 21-day wilderness adventure program to determine its viability as an alternative for adjudicated juveniles who are placed on probation. Based on an extensive literature review it was proposed that a wilderness program based on the Outward Bound philosophy could offer an adventurous, educational and structural experience that would be directed to altering the self-esteem and attitudes of delinquent youths, which in turn would act as a catalyst to reducing future delinquent behavior. A true-experimental design with 30 male probationers, ages 13-16, in the control and experimental group was used. The groups were matched on a number of variables which included age, sex, frequency of prior offense and various background characteristics. The Jesness Inventory and adapted Peirs-Harris Self-Esteem Measure were the two standardized personality measures used in the pre, post, and 4 to 6 month follow-up testing periods. In addition, self-report data on recidivism, background characteristics, and behavioral as well as attitudinal changes were gathered from both groups. The experimental groups (three groups of ten for each of the three summer sessions) were also evaluated by the staff in addition to completing a self-report questionnaire about the program. No significant relations between exposure to the wilderness program

and subsequent attitudinal or behavioral changes were observed for the standardized measures or the reconviction rates. There were, for example, significant changes on only three of fourteen possible sub-scales at the posttest, but none at the follow-up. The only noticeable, but no significant, difference was the type of offenses committed by the recidivists in the follow-up. The offenses tended to be fewer and less "severe" for the experimental group. This lent some support to the main theorem which stated that the program is a viable alternative for youths (males) on probation. In addition, the results from the Student Rating Form, for the experimental group, provided evidence for a possible predictive measure. The implications of the results and recommendations based on staff reports and those of the parents are discussed. The recommendations included using the program as a supplement to probation, introducing a process evaluation and improving referral and screening procedures. Another major recommendation included a call for the need for some form of post structure for juveniles after they leave such a course, as well as the possibility that some may have to remain in some form of residential setting.

A BOY FROM THE CITIES' STREETS

Give me a boy from the cities' streets,
From the gloom, despair and dismay,
A lump of coal from the soddy mass,
Who would follow the wayward way.

Let me cleanse his soul in the sparkling blue,
Of a forest lake so clear.
Let me lead him down a shaded path,
Where wild voices he can hear.

Let him see the pine, let him fish the bass,
Let him find his God and worth.
For in these open places,
He will find his second birth.

He will find the value of good friends,
Of truth and things well done.
He will see life's truest meaning,
In the setting evening sun.
This boy has not had a chance,
To shed the cities' grime.
Will now find truth, real values,
Trust, in nature's treasure mine.

Yes, give me some coal from the cities' heap,
Perhaps distained to burn.
But polished by God's great outdoors,
A diamond I'll return.

Unknown.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This project would not have been completed without the assistance, support and participation of a number of people. I would, therefore, like to extend my thanks and appreciation to:

--Rick Mazur who established the A.C.T.I.O.N. program and allowed me to become involved. Throughout the formulation and completion he contributed invaluable support and friendship.

--Dr. Ronald Roesch who, as my senior supervisor, patiently waded through my earlier drafts, lending much assistance and direction.

--Dr. Curt Griffiths who also assisted in earlier readings and lent much moral support at critical stages.

--Mr. Bill Hughes, a highly respected and experienced individual in the field of outdoor experiential education programs, who acted as my external examiner and offered insightful suggestions.

--Dianne, my wife, who spent many hours reviewing, typing and lending her strength and support through the "crests" and "eddies" of this study.

I would also like to extend a special thanks to all the research participants, especially the A.C.T.I.O.N. crews and staff from whom I learnt a great deal about inter-communication, and all those others who helped along the way, i.e., Aileen Sams, Bill Glackman and Klaus Kohlmeyer to name but a few.

Finally I would like to thank the Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services for funding a large portion of the project.

8

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval....................ii

Abstract....................iii

A Boy From the Cities' Streets....................v

Acknowledgement....................vi

Table of Contents....................viii

List of Tables....................x

A. Introduction....................1

B. Examination of Juvenile Delinquency, Probation and Possible Alternatives....................8

C. History of Outdoor Survival-Oriented Programs....................22

D. The Ideology of Therapeutic and Wilderness Survival Programs. 30

E. Review of Wilderness Survival Training Programs....................41

F. Theoretical and Methodological Evaluation and Critique of Evaluative Studies for Adaptive Outward Bound Programs.66

G. A.C.T.I.O.N. 1978....................72

H. A.C.T.I.O.N. 1979....................75

- Program Objectives....................76
- Purpose of Study....................77
- Main Theorem....................80

I. Method....................84

- Participants....................84
- Staffing....................87
- Training Session....................89
- Measures....................90

Design..102

Testing Procedures..106

Data Analysis...110

J. Results..114

K. Disscusion...177

General Recommendations...................................186

Specific Reccmmendations..................................191

Bibliography..201

Appendix A..217

Appendix B..219

Appendix C..231

Appendix D..233

Appendix E..235

Appendix F..241

Appendix G..245

Appendix H..252

Appendix I..254

Appendix J..256

Appendix K..261

Appendix L..270

Appendix M..273

Appendix N..281

Appendix O..287

LIST OF TABLES

Table Pages

1 Survey of the Growth in Probation, in Canada, During 1970's.. 14

2 Summary of Wilderness Adventure Programs.......... 45-52

3 Background Characteristics for Experimental (N=30) and Control Group(N=30)............................ 87

4 Mean and Standard Deviation for 15 Year-old Male Delinquents and Non-delinquents on Ten Scales of the Jesness Inventory.......................... 95

5 Research Design for Program A.C.T.I.O.N. 1979.... 105

6 Program A.C.T.I.O.N. Expenditures 1978-1979...... 131

7 T-test Results for Pre-test on Experimental and Control Groups on the Jesness Inventory.......... 132

8 T-test Results for Post-test on Experimental and Control Groups on the Jesness Inventory.......... 133

9 T-test Results for Follow-up on Experimental and Control Groups on the Jesness Inventory.......... 134

10 Analysis of Covariance on Jesness Inventory for Pre-Post Data: Main Effect Explained............. 135

11 T-test Results for Pre-test Data of Experimental and Control Groups on the Self-Esteem Scales: A & B Form Combined............................. 136

12 T-test Results for Post-test Data of Experimental and Control Groups on the Self-Esteem Scales: A & B Form Combined.............................. 137

13 T-test Results for Follow-up Data of Experimental and Control Groups on the Self-Esteem scales: A & B Form Combined.............................. 138

14 Analysis of Covariance Results on the Self-Esteem Scales for Pre(1), Post(2), and Follow-up(3) Data.. 139

15 Mean Scores and Range of Ratings for Instructors' Rating Forms on the Experimental Group (N=30).... 140

16 Factor Analysis Scores for Self-Esteem Items: Parts A & B.................................... 141-143

17 Selected Family Background Information for Experimental Group (N=30)........................ 144

18 Relationship with Father and Mother: Experimental Group (N=30)........................ 145

19A Assessment of A.C.T.I.O.N. Activities by Experimental Group (N=30)........................ 146

19B Experimental Groups Opinion of How to 'Get Along' at Camp (N=30)................................. 146

20 Experimental Groups Perceptions of the Program (N=30)................................... 148

21 Experimental Groups Feelings About Leaving the Course (N=30).................................... 149

22 Parents' Assessment of Selected Attitudes, Behavior and Educational Performance............ 150-151

23 Parents' Assessment of Attitudinal and Behavioral Changes for the A.C.T.I.O.N. Participants........ 152

24 Parents' Assessment of "Problem" Areas after Probation Termination.......................... 153

25 Personal Characteristics, Family Stability and Demographic Variables............................ 154-158

26 Family Criminality............................... 159

27 Educational Status of probationers............... 160

28 Areas Considered to be Important for Success/Failure During Probation......................... 161

29 Incidence of Problems and Changes During Probation Period.. 162

30 Delinquency History and Related Issues........... 163-165

31 Follow-up Assessment of Probation................ 166

32 Kendall Correlation Coefficient for Instructors' Rating Forms between Testing Interval Scores..... 167-168

33 Selected Occupational/School Characteristics..... 169-170

34 Experimental Groups Follow-up Assessment of A.C.T.I.O.N. (N=29)............................. 171

35 Interaction with the Law: Peer and Participants...................................... 172-173

36 Self-Esteem Measure Pre- and Post- Mean Score Comparison of "Successors" (N=25) and "Failures"

(N=5) in Experimental Group........................ 173

37 Recidivism Data for Experimental and Control Group.. 174-175

38 Jesness Inventory Pre- and Post- Mean Score Comparison of "Successes" (N=25) and "Failures" (N=5) in Experimental Group........................ 176

A. Introduction

Juvenile delinquency in North America appears to be reaching epidemic proportions (Golins, 1977; Kelly & Baer, 1968; Sepler, 1979). This observation has also been reflected in Canada by the Research Division of the Ministry of the Solicitor General (1979) which noted that few social problems rival juvenile delinquency as a source of concern and urgency today. With the awareness of this perplexing problem, the literature on (juvenile) corrections has not only called for the development of new procedures in the control of crime and delinquency, but also for thorough evaluations of existing programs currently being employed by the correctional system (Adams, 1977; Bell, 1974; Bernstein, 1975; Glaser, 1977; Lundman & Scarpitti, 1978; and the Solicitor General Report, 1979). In essence there has been a move towards identifying which types of programs work for what type of clientele.

In recent years, however, there has been much controversy about "what works" in correctional treatment, both for adults and juveniles (Adams, 1977; Bailey, 1966; Wright & Dixon, 1977). One of the key reports which created a great deal of debate was Robert Martinson's (1974) now infamous article--"What Works? Questions and Answers About Prison Reform", in which he suggested nothing works! Since the controversial report appeared, however, a number of researchers have challenged the article on a number of factors including; methodological principles, theoretical structure, research design, and/or on the inferences drawn from the analyses (i.e., Adams, 1975, 1977; Gendreau & Ross, 1979; Murray & Cox Jr., 1979). And despite Martinson himself retracting his 1974 statements in 1978, when he said I "naively assumed that the kind of evaluation research assumed in the ECT was the proper way to do research" (Criminal Justice Newsletter, Oct. 26, 1978, p. 4), the debate concerning program effectiveness continues to rage on to the point where there are virtually two camps--those who agree with Martinson and those opposed. There are even those now who argue against the use of applied field research (i.e., Gottfredson, 1979; Hackler, 1978).

Notwithstanding the above controveries, it is now agreed by many that some programs for both adults and juveniles do work under certain conditions (see Gendreau & Ross, 1979). The concern is shifting from not just identifying if a program works, but for whom, and why they work (Lundman & Scarpitti, 1978; Solicitor General Report, 1979; Warren, 1971). Subsequently, the sole reliance on a common measure such as recidivism (rate of reconviction) has also stimulated renewed efforts to find better and more sophisticated measures of "success" in programs such as those for juvenile delinquents. (Birkenmayer & Polonoski, 1976; Gendreau, Grant & Leipciger, 1979). The need for more sophisticated evaluation procedures has also, in part, been influenced by the number of theories attempting to explain delinquency.

One of the major explanations that has been offered as a possible model for understanding delinquency and justifying the need for a multivariate approach in evaluation are the opportunity and self-concept paradigms (Jesness, 1971; Reckless & Dinitz, 1967; Sarason, 1972). Lemire (1975: 16), for example, has noted that "one's view of oneself and/or others may be a determinant factor of one's attitudes, beliefs and behaviors." That is, the poorer one's view of oneself, the more negative one's perception and resultant behavior. Similarly, researchers such as Fannin and Clinnard (1965) have pointed to the delinquents' poor self-concept and personality deficiencies as reasons for delinquent (socially-maladaptive) behavior. While others like Kelly and Baer (1968) have suggested that the current rise in delinquency can, in part, be related to the diminishing opportunity afforded adolescents to establish their identity, demonstrate their individuality, and develop a sense of responsibility. In other words, adults fail to provide them with a clear "rite-de-passage" to adulthood.

Trying to bridge the social and psychological models, Gable and Brown (1978) have identified three major causes of delinquency as: 1) inadequate adult supervision at home; 2) inadequate economic and social resources to become successful in society; and 3) inadequate acculturation to compete academically in school. They note, however, that the causes do not account for all types of delinquency but can serve as a general theoretical model for most. While these explanations are not the definitive ones for explaining or understanding delinquent behavior, they do serve as rationales for a number of programs.

The early realization of the assumption that diminished opportunities and identity problems for most delinquents need not necessarily be solely symptomatic of some deep underlying personality problem(s) that must be uncovered and treated (i.e., medical model), has led a number of researchers to propose that delinquency may be a natural product of the environment, society, and family upbringing (see, for example, Birkenmayer & Polonoski, 1976; Glueck & Glueck, 1970). This then is reflected in the youth's motivational readiness to respond to his opportunities. Early cultural anthropologists, such as Whiting, Kluckholn and Anthony (1958), appear to offer one interpretation of delinquency that bridges the medical model and socio-psychological perspective. Whiting et al. borrow the term "identification with the aggressor", coined by Anna Freud, to explain the son-father-mother conflict. They used the general concept to illustrate how, for most sects in our society, there is no clearcut demarcation between childhood and adulthood; neither socially, physiologically, nor legally. This is especially true when compared to primitive societies in which a pubescent rite, often involving the demonstration of physical strength, stamina and ability to accept responsibility, served a similar purpose. From their theoretical orientation Whiting et al. concluded with the speculation that one possible way of reducing delinquency would be through instituting a formal means of coping with adolescents, functionally equivalent to the pubescent rites found within primitive societies. While this observation seems representative of most adolescents, it would appear to be very appropriate for "kids in trouble" given the models of explanation.

For example, a number of writers (Erickson, 1968; Fannin & Clinard, 1965; Jesness, 1971) have associated negative self-concept, immaturity, social alienation, lack of personal identity and delinquent employment of anti-social behavior as a means of (adolescent) protest. Social psychologists and other professionals have also noted that a common means for young people to contend with conflict and tension is through acting out (Clifford & Clifford, 1967; Redl & Wineman, 1957). Similarly, Kelly and Baer (1968: 4) have inferred from their review of the juvenile literature that the "preference for action may explain the apparent failure of extant and traditional cognitive oriented 'talk therapy' to modify the undesirable behavior of delinquents." Of the programs that have been modeled with a preference for action there are the Outward Bounds Schools and/or adapted programs such as the one to be presented--program A.C.T.I.O.N.

Program A.C.T.I.O.N. (Accepting Challenge Through Interaction with Others and Nature), like Outward Bound, exposes (juveniles) young people to 21-days of physical challenges such as climbing and rappelling, canoe expeditions and backpacking treks. The objective is to provide a structured educational environment, build physical stamina, and to develop in each individual emotional and physical strengths. Thus the participant, in order to complete the course, is called upon to achieve beyond what they believed they are capable; to demonstrate and experience their abilities and weaknesses in a way that is easier to relate to than talking or close supervision (Kelly and Baer, 1968). The experience relies on doing or ACTION. And as Margolin (1969), among others, has asserted, employing physical action under an educational setting would not only be a unique experience, but also "enjoyable" and conducive to a healthy functional learning and therapeutic environment (i.e., Birkenmayer & Polonoski, 1973).

The present study was an attempt to determine if a wilderness-survival-oriented experience was more effective in reducing further delinquent behavior after a 4 to 6 month follow-up period for adjudicated juvenile probationers as compared to a control group who did not attend the program but remained simply on probation. In addition, by participating in an A.C.T.I.O.N. course the delinquent's self-esteem and general behavior would improve and that he would adopt a more socially acceptable mode of behavior. This will be further reviewed in the following section.

Before presenting the 1979 A.C.T.I.O.N. evaluation, an overview of the development, status and perception of juvenile delinquency will be presented in order to offer a clearer understanding of the types of participants involved in the study. Special emphasis is placed on the Canadian scene where possible. This will be followed by a historical and general literature review and critique of wilderness-survival oriented programs.

B. Examination of Juvenile Delinquency, Probation and Possible Alternatives

Does the present juvenile probation system work? This question has been asked directly and indirectly over the past years by a number of researchers (Amos, 1974; Bell, 1974; Gendreau, 1979; Kitchener House Inc., 1977; Martinson, 1974, 1976, 1978; Quay, 1977; Stephenson, 1973). The underlying issue appears to be related to the objectives which are measured to assess whether a program is successful or not.

It seems most programs assume that they have to modify behavior overtly in order for it to be of any merit. Juvenile probation is no exception. Before delving into this controversy, however, it is considered best to first define who constitues a delinquent and a probationer, both legally and practically for considerations of the present study.

Definitions of Delinquency. According to Coughlan (1963), the notion of delinquency has been around since 1693 and the concept of probation, in America, since 1841. Yet the legal definition of delinquency is no easier to grasp than the legal definition of crime or criminality. Delinquency appears to be a nebulous legal and social label that can vary from country to country, and from province to province (see, for example, the Juvenile Delinquency Act, 1972). Stephenson (1973) has suggested that the definition problem is in part attributable to the "myths" that legal and lay people have about juvenile delinquency. A primary myth is that all juvenile delinquents represent a homogeneous group, usually characterized by emotional problems, low intelligence, reading disabilities, and tend to come from lower class backgrounds that are plagued with unstable family settings. Consequently, the legal realm treats the problem of "juvenile delinquency" as a uniform phenomenon and expresses little discrimination in the adjudication of the young offender (Stephenson, 1973). For example, a youth in Canada is not charged with a specific act of delinquency, but rather charged with a "condition of delinquency".

The 1978 Criminal Code (C.C.) of Canada has defined the term juvenile delinquent as:

> Any child who violates any provision of any federal or provincial statute, or any by-law or ordinance of any municipality or who is guilty of sexual immorality or any similar form of vice, or who is liable by reason of any other act to be committed to an industrial school or reformatory under any federal or provincial statute. sec. 2.1.

A youth is legally defined as a child if he is under the age of sixteen years, unless otherwise stated in the province. Depending on where one lives, a youth between the ages seven and eighteen may be subject to the Juvenile Delinquency Act (JDA). In Ontario, where this study was conducted, the age limit is 16.

Given the foregoing discussion, the concept of a juvenile delinquent will from here on simply refer to the legal definition as sighted in sec. 2.1 of the Criminal Code above.

Juvenile Delinquents Act. Not only does the law encompass a wide scope of control over juvenile behavior per se, but the wording of the Juvenile Delinquency Act is such that it suggests that children between the ages seven and sixteen lack any capacity to be rational or capable of being responsible for their acts. In fact, the wording of section 13 of the Juvenile Delinquency Act; "unless he is competent to know the nature and consequence of his conduct and to apreciate that it was wrong", is very similar to that of the insanity defence. The Juvenile Delinquency Act is also designed to provide the court with complete control over the adjudication or disposition of a youth. This is exemplified in sec. 17 of the Juvenile Delinquency Act; "because of any informality or irregularity where it appears that the disposition of the case was in the best interest of the child." The phrase "best interest of the child" is further reflected in the ancient concept of "parens patriae", which means that the court is empowered to act as the guardian of all children in need of care or protection. Therefore, upon entry into the court a juvenile is left almost completely at the discretion of "his elders".

The court can take a number of actions, both formal and informal, in dealing with the juvenile offender. For example, sec. 20 of the Juvenile Delinquency Act, as amended by C17; s. 282, in 1972, outlines the court's dispositional powers as follows:

1. suspend final disposition;
2. adjourn the hearing;
3. impose a fine not exceeding $25, which may be paid in installments;
4. commit to custody or care of a probation officer or any other suitable person;
5. allow to remain home, but subject to visits by a probation officer as often as may be deemed advisable;
6. placed in a suitable home...subject to the friendly supervision of a probation officer;
7. commit to the charge of childrens aid society;
8. commit to an industrial school duly approved by the lieutentant governor in council.

All the above alternatives tend to emphasize the notion of "treating" juveniles. But under some provincial legislation, there are some dispositions such as youth containment and remand centers which make no stated purpose of treatment. It is, nevertheless, the judge's responsibility to assume the role of guardian over the adolescent and to decide which alternative is considered to be in the best interest of the youth. (Although the Young Offenders Act has not yet been implemented since its formulation in 1975, it will be interesting to see if it is accepted and how the shift from "parens patriae" to a responsibility model will affect the "treatment" models--will we end up with more remand centers for juveniles?). For example, sec. 3(2) of the Juvenile Delinquency Act reads that the court, upon recognizing the offense of a juvenile as a delinquent act will be required to offer "help, guidance and proper supervision." The decisions, however, very often have little or no bearing on the objective of the disposition. Rather, the outcomes frequently reflect a bias of the court or judge and/or available opportunities. Emerson (1969), Griffiths (1977), and Vinter (1962) have all recognized this basic problem in the juvenile court decision making process. Cicourel (1969) suggested that part of the problem is related to the variablility in the organizational structure. As an example, Sosin and Sarri (1977) imply that in many cases, due process of a delinquent is not only a matter of what is convenient and feasible, but is perhaps nothing more than a myth. Sosin and Sarri's point lends further support to that of Stephensons' (1973). Finally, the alternatives and decision for the placement of the adolescent offender are often the by-product of what is the best "dumping ground" at the time; as Besharov (1971: 215) has observed:

> Probation supervision tends to be a dumping ground for all the difficult delinquents when the judge is afraid to send them back into the community without some protection from future misgiving or criticism...the effect is the dilution and misapplication of limited resources. For many juveniles, then, the circumstances of probation invite failure.

Another explanation for the lack of consistency in the selection of the "best" disposition, whether it be probation or something else, can in part be associated with the inability of researchers to accurately predict future delinquency and the effect of certain alternatives (i.e., Hemple et al., 1976; Simon, 1971). Even though Morris (1974), among others, has pointed out that the commission of future violent acts cannot be predicted by statistical models alone, they can go a long way toward reucing the error of intuitive feelings, or years of experience, upon which many decisions rely. Partial support for the human element in decision making has, however, come from Hemple et al. (1976) who have suggested that despite personal opinions running the risk of being locked into the self-fulfilling prophecy predicament, there must always be a human element of judgment involved where human interests are at stake (see Gottfredson, 1967, for further discussion).

One of the dispositions more frequently used for delinquent offenders over the past few years has been probation supervision. Since 1970, the approximate percentage for juveniles being placed on probation has been increasing slightly (see Table 1).

This increase has also been recognized in the United States by Sepler (1979). His report lends support to the general inefficiency of the court system in handling juveniles and indirectly offers it as a possible explanation for

TABLE 1

Survey of the Growth in Probation, in Canada, During 1970's

Date	Total Del. Reported	Information dealt with rate per 100,000	Approx. % on probation.	Type of Disposition ranked in frequency
1970	37,119	818	30	- suspended - fine & restitution
1971	38,797	848	34.3	- " - "
1972	44,183	924	31	- " - "
1973	44,151	968	28	- " - "

Date	Total Del. Reported	Total # Informally dealt with	Approx. % on probation.	Type of Disposition ranked in frequency
1974	59,190	3,353	36	- suspended - fine & resitution
1975	64,437	2,908	34.5	- " - "
1976	68,555	3,392	35	- " - "
1977	69,282	2,642	35	- " - "

Source: Statistics Canada Cat.No. 85 202, 1965-1973, 1974-1977.

Note: The % rate for each category, suspended, and fine and restitution has gone up from 10.2% in 1970 to 24% in 1977.

Note: The three most frequently reported offence categories included theft -- having in possession (under $200), break and enter, and liquor and traffic violations.

Note: The statistics should be viewed with a conservative eye because from 1974-1977 B.C., P.E.I., and the N.W.T. had incomplete reporting, so no data was available for these provinces.

the growth of probation as one of the "dumping grounds". For example, Sepler (1979: 64) graphically and statistically shows how the protective services of the Criminal Justice System for juveniles and adults are "becoming 8.5% less efficient and 9% less effective in controlling crime each year." Hence the problem of identifying delinquency and the purpose of probation.

Probation. Probation has been radically modified from its orginal purpose. The term probation is a derivation from the Latin meaning; "a period of proving or trial". Initial interest in probation appears to have stemmed from the humanitarian concern over the welfare of children who had come into conflict with the law (Coughlan, 1963). For example, Boyd (1978) noted that originally, probation was handled by such humanitarian private agencies as the John Howard Society, John Augustus, Elizabeth Fry Society and Children's Aid Society. Similarly, the early development of probation in Canada strongly reflected the idea of citizen participation and close supervision and guidance. But Coughlan (1963) argues that these general principles have since been altered after the Canadian government became involved in handling juvenile probation.

Probation first became available in Canada as a legal alternative to incarceration in 1908, with the passage of the Juvenile Delinquency Act. The Juvenile Delinquency Act was perhaps the complement to an act fifty-one years earlier (1857), by the provinces Upper and Lower Canada, which asked for "the more speedy trial and punishment of juvenile offenders" (Boyd, 1978: 356).

At the turn of this century J.J. Kelso, then Ontario's Superintendent of Neglected and Dependent Children, felt that the responsibility of the probation officer should be the supervision over wayward, disobedient, unpredictable and headstrong children. Officers were expected to visit the juvenile's home, see to it that the youth was in school..."and thus effectually stopping them from getting into further trouble" (Boyd, 1978: 360). Boyd further noted that the underlying principle of the probation act was to provide youths with strict control and supervision. The need for such rigid guidance was buttressed with the contention that:

1. the homes of these boys are so dirty and uninviting, with parents frequently absent and drunk and quarrelling when at home;
2. the low class theatre is also responsible for creating an unhealthy sentiment in the mind of such boys;
3. the small boys who sell newspapers and stand around the down-town corners so much, should be under the constant supervision of a probation officer. (From the Ontario Sessional Papers, 1901, No. 43; in Boyd, 1978: 360-361).

The notion that the lower classes are mainly responsible for delinquency has since been supported to varying degrees by the Gluecks' (1970) and Wolfgang et al. (1970) who cite a number of studies discussing the relationship between emotional deprivation, parent occupation and family life in the lower classes. More recently Renner (1978), in a review of the juvenile probationer in Ontario, held criteria very similar to those considered by Kelso, Glueck and Glueck, and Wolfgang et al. to be important. Renner looked at probationers' personal characteristics, family and friends, educational background, delinquent history of the probationer and his family, probation success and a score of other social and demographic variables.

Based on a random sample of 730 probationers, Renner found that without the obvious systemic predictors such as type of previous disposition, number of dispositions, or further charges laid during the probation period, he could predict, in approximately 70% of all the cases, individuals who would succeed or fail on probation. The predictors were somewhat similar to those of Kelso and the others. In order of importance, the critical predictor variables included:

1. Family feelings--"considerable instability".
2. Number of school problems--"many spent little or no time at school".
3. Employment status of clients--"usually unemployed".
4. Association with nondelinquents--"lived in towns less than 10,000 in population."
5. Family stability in childhood--in over 25% there was a lack of cohesiveness.

6. Status of neighborhood--over 85% came from lower class neighborhoods with incomes less than $8,000, while the population average was over $15,000. (See Renner, 1978, for further statistical relationships).

Given the growing number of juveniles being diverted to probation along with the findings of Renner (1978), the opinions of Kelso in 1908 and Stephenson in 1973 might suggest that the lower classes are growing and youths are either turning to more delinquency and therefore in need of more supervision, or more realistically, as noted earlier, probation is becoming a "dumping ground" and reflective of an increasingly ineffective and inefficient judicial system. In addition, it may be that Renner's sample was somewhat biased as his respondents were presented more by the lower-classes and they may be treated somewhat differently than other classes (see, for example, Richards et al., 1979, for a comprehensive review of middle class theories and observations).

Probation by itself may functionally have a great deal of utility, but any system that has its objectives distorted will inevitably run the risk of creating more problems than it solves (Clarke, 1979; Coughlan, 1963). Furthermore, probation does not offer a change of environment or provide constant supervision and it tends to rely only on "talk therapy". Therefore, because of the difficulty in identifying the function of probation, a probationer, for the purpose of this study, will simply refer to any juvenile who is under the supervision of a probation order as a result of an adjudication by a judge.

Alternatives for Adjudicated Delinquents. Despite a number of problems that appear to be reflected in the organizational structure, the juvenile correctional system has attempted to provide alternative programs to probation for juveniles that would appear to be appropriate for varying types of young offenders. In response to the problems, several researchers have suggested that the juvenile requires only simple sanctions (i.e., Kelly, 1971; Rutherford, 1974). For example, Amos (1974) noted that the sanctions need only to promote reform and encourage self-development, because the juveniles were not so much "bad" as they were the product of poor upbringing, lacked adequate education, lacked opportunity, and proper role models. Suggestions that have been offered and empirically evaluated include: 1) a form of residential facility (Costello, 1975; Witherspoon, 1966), 2) a potential for academic upgrading (Brown, 1975; Jaywardene et al., 1977; Ross, 1979), 3) family counselling (Alexander & Parsons, 1973), and 4) survival-oriented wilderness programs (Brown & Simpson, 1976). Based on the suggestions aimed at reforming and encouraging self-development a number of programs have been developed, some of which include: diversion, training schools, groups homes, community order projects and adapted Outward Bound courses. The present evaluation is concerned with the latter alternative.

Summary. This overview of delinquency and probation has served to illustrate that the population being dealt with is complex in relation to any specific type of delinquent. This has in part been attributed to the inability of the judicial system to clarify the meaning of delinquency and purpose of probation. In addition, while it appears that a majority of delinquents on probation represent the lower classes and appear to reflect self-esteem and identity problems, it has been observed that these are not the sole factors for understanding delinquency. Consequently, it was suggested that the use of the alternatives available for disposition are a product of convenience/familiarity rather than what "is in the best interest" of the youth. This further complicates the functional utility of assessing correctional projects as many of them are products of a "dumping ground". The process by which a youth, for example, whether in Ontario or elsewhere in Canada, is funneled into probation alone is a phenomenon worthy of investigation (see, for example, Corrado et al., 1978). Therefore, we are left with a contradiction of interests. While researchers are interested in identifying what works for whom, they have difficulty in controlling the independent measures.

Subsequently, the legal definitions for referring to juvenile delinquency and probation were preferred as they adequately serve to identify the population in general terms. The legal interpretations also avoid the controversies of labelling delinquents with sociological and/or psychological explanations, as well it complementing the ideological model underlying the A.C.T.I.O.N. program, which will be discussed below.

C. History of Outdoor Survival-Oriented Programs

Mitchell and Crawford (1950) were among the first to recognize the benefits of camping programs for youths in North America. Their report, based primarily on participant observation reports, noted how camping appeared to improve the self-esteem of "well-to-do boys" who had nothing to do during the summer months. Mitchell and Crawford (1950) also observed that as early as 1890 summer camps were offered to the rich as a constructive means of using their time. Several years later, Bettleheim (1952) reported that not only were camping programs practical for giving boys something to do (no mention of girls was made) it was also a good means of character building, by offering the youths a means of developing a goal-directed behavior. The camps operated under the general guise of hard work. Although "hard work" has been defined differently between programs, essentially it is based on both accomplishment and cooperation. This concept has since been realized by a number of organizations such as the Boy Scouts, YMCA, YWCA, various school programs, and has even become an established institution in Outward Bound (O.B.) and NOLS (National Outdoor Leadership School).

In 1957, the journal of Social Issues dedicated an entire issue to the utility of therapeutic camping experiences. One of the articles by McNeil observed that wilderness camps were good for ones' mental health by offering not only an environmental change but also a form of disciplinary activity that required self-discipline. McNeil (1957: 3) points out that the dictum of a "sound mind in a strong body" is a fundamental underlying principle of the camping programs.

In the United States the early realization of the potential of camping programs for emotional and physical growth was well recognized, but it was also realized that the utility of such programs was limited because not all youths would or could benefit from such programs. Thus survival programs should not be exploited to the point where they would lose their impact. With the growing number of camping programs, McNeil (1957) noted the philosophies and purpose of the various programs were also changing. Not only were programs being reserved for the well-to-do, but they were slowly being employed for adjudicated delinquents and other sectors of the population. The growth was somewhat limited, however, due to funding problems, and a failure to realize their potential utility for special groups until the 1960's when Kurt Hahn's experiential education concepts were introduced into the United States, from Britian, with the assistance of Josh Miner.

It was Hahn's original ideas that have helped form the basis for a majority of juvenile wilderness programs around the world today, and it was Hahn's principles that helped to weld the therapeutic camp objectives with the wilderness survival oriented training tasks.

Hahn, born of Jewish parents in 1886 in Germany, was a man who appeared to be quite concerned about his physical health, and as Stewart (1970) has observed, it greatly influenced his life and perception of others. As a result of the times and his personal feelings about life, he was caught up in political controversies that led to various problems for himself, before having to leave Germany in 1934. Before he left however, he acted as Headmaster of the Salem School, a co-education private school, founded by Prince Max in Bavaria. It was through the encouragement of the Prince that he developed the prototype for what was later to be known as Outward Bound. The Salem School and its philosophy brought Hahn international acclaim as a pioneering educator. In 1932, however, after publically expressing his defiance of the Nazis uprising, and of Hitler, he was imprisoned until 1933 when the influence of friends such as Ramsey MacDonald, then prime minister of Great Britain, aided in his release. Upon his release Hahn fled to the United Kingdom.

Shortly after arriving in England, in 1934, Hahn founded the Gordonstoun School, into which he transplanted the essential elements of the Salem system. These elements consisted of training young people to have moral independence, an ability to choose between "right and wrong", and an improvement in their physical well being. Kesselheim (1976: 2) in a review of Hahn's work, outlined the objectives of the Gordonstoun School as follows:

1. give children a chance to discover themselves;
2. see to it that children experience both success and defeat;
3. see to it that children have the chance to forget themselves in the pursuit of a common cause;
4. train the imagination, the ability to participate and plan;
5. take sports and games seriously, but only as part of the whole.

Rohrs and Tunstall-Behrens (1970) appropriately identified the terms of Hahn's basic philosophical tenets as "experience therapy" in which the experiences are directed more towards developing "integrity of the soul", in Platonic fashion, rather than developing intellectual and emotional toughness which were already presumed a part of their demeanor. The concepts were not new but they were to prove, in time, that they would have far more reaching application than even Kurt Hahn was able to foresee.

With the onset of World War II there was not only a need to train people to handle the unexpected demands of war, but to also train soldiers to react appropriately to stressful situations. This need was demonstrated clearly when supposedly highly trained seamen were unable to deal with the hazards confronting them sea battles. Templin and Baldwin (1976) have pointed out that seamen, at the time, were often unable or unprepared to survive the hardships of being alone in the ocean awaiting possible rescue. Therefore, in response to the seamens enigma the first Outward Bound School was founded at Aberdovery, Wales, in 1941, and as Templin and Baldwin noted, it was perhaps just as much a product of a "historical accident" as it was the outgrowth of Hahn's ingenuity. Nevertheless, opportune events such as these led to the development of the Outward Bound philosophy that is still the basis for most of the schools today. (For a more vivid personal description of the development of the first school and its ideas see Hogan, 1968).

From 1945 to 1962 Outward Bound evolved and expanded in the United Kingdom until by 1963 there were six schools, including one for girls at Esksdale. It was during the early sixties that some prominant American educators recognized the possible merits of such a program and what it could offer problem youths (as well as other populations) in the United States. In response to the American interest, Hahn in 1962, commented upon the need for international recognition and expansion of Outward Bound when he said:

> The young today are surrounded by tempting declines--declines which affect the adult world--decline of fitness, and imagination, due to the confused restlessness of modern life; decline of skill and care, due to the weakened traditional modern life; decline of self-discipline, due to stimulants and tranquilizers. Worst of all, the decline in compassion, due to the unseemly haste with which modern life is conducted. (Templin and Baldwin, 1976: 15).

Even though therapeutic camps existed (see Hobbs et al., 1972; Mondschein, 1966-67) in the United States, it was not until Josh Miner's efforts that Outward Bound was introduced into the U.S. Miner himself suggested that it was a result of the social climate that Outward Bound was recognized as a viable educational program and correctional alternative for the American scene. As noted earlier, however, outdoor camps were not completely foreign to corrections. Up until 1966, over twenty States in the U.S. were operating institutional facilities that were referred to as "camps" and "forest camps" (Gonzales, 1972: 87). The original camps, however, were more work oriented than concerned with adventure and survival practices. (See Lingle, 1980 for a review of the various alternative camping programs).

The first Outward Bound School to open in the U.S. was located on the western slopes of the Rocky Mountains in Colorado, in 1962. The 27-day program involved mountain walking, backpacking, high altitude camping, rapelling and rock climbing, as well as a three day solo survival experience, which was more extensive than in the original British Schools (Willman & Chun, 1973). The specific goals of the program were:

1. To establish relationships between the student and the instructor in a neutral environment. To confront and solve problems together.
2. To create a group indentity, a reference group, and to learn

to work together and to help one another.

3. To enhance the student's self-image by helping him overcome a graded set of physical and mental challenges. Resulting self-confidence would enable the youth to contribute to the total group.
4. To provide the boys with an acceptable male image.
5. To promote communication through group discussion. Better understanding of own and others' needs and thereby better human relations.
6. To provide legitimate adventure as an acceptable release, resulting in a better appreciation of recreation and leisure time activities (Outward Bound Report 1969, p. 6 in Barcus and Bergeson, 1972: 4).

As can be observed from the specific goals the program, which are experientially oriented, can be readily adapted to varying populations as it is assumed that people in general have room for personal growth, both at a physical and mental level, whether it be for businessmen or adjudicated delinquents.

In 1964, the Colorado school accepted its first adjudicated delinquents, five in all, from the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services (Kelly and Baer, 1968). This was not only the start of a series of schools to be developed across the states, but also the beginning of a number of juvenile programs to be established in conjunction with the Outward Bound programs or those founded on similar concepts as those of Outward Bound.

Even though the Canadian scene has been slower in responding to the use of adapted Outward Bound programs, well over two dozen exist in Canada today; compared to over 1,000 in the United States. Thus, Hahn's efforts appear to have met with prosperity, as not only have corrections adapted the program for handling delinquents and young adult offenders, but there are now approximately 34 Outward Bound Schools in seventeen countries throughout the world (Rice, 1979).

D. The Ideology of Therapeutic and Wilderness Survival Programs

What you hear
you forget;
What you see
you remember;
What you do
you know.

Chinese Proverb.

The A.C.T.I.O.N. program meant to provide probationers with a structured intensive wilderness/stress experience that would supposedly lead the young offenders to develop nondelinquent values and qualities of self-control, self-confidence and interpersonal maturity. The underlying philosophy of the program asserts that the objectives can be met under wilderness survival conditions. However, other than Kurt Hahn's idea of "development through energetic participation"; which suggests that true learning and growth is only possible through experience therapy, few researchers have forwarded a theory that proposed to explain the relationship between wilderness experiences and its expected results (i.e., Smith et al., 1975; Kimball, 1979).

This section will present a humanistic eclectic behavioral approach that will serve to explain the proposed utility of wilderness programs, as well as the reasoning behind the variables used as criteria to measure success. The humanistic eclectic behavioral approach is preferred for the following reasons: (a) it is a functional approach and (b) it avoids trying to offer an all embracing theory of delinquency which might purport a causal association. Before presenting the humanistic behavioral approach, however, the experiential educational component deserves clarification as it is an important component of the program.

The Value of Experiential Education. As with other adapted Outward Bound programs (see Kelly & Baer, 1968, and Smith et al., 1975) it was assumed that the A.C.T.I.O.N. project was not only therapeutic but also intrinsically educational. The educational merit of such programs has received support from Brown (1975), Mondeschein (1966), and Platt et al.(1976). The educational ideology is compelling in outdoor-type program's because of the nature of the programs content and structure.

Although it is difficult to place a specific number of hours of instruction and practice on each activity, as we do in a formal educational setting, the wilderness activities and experiences nevertheless represent a learning environment. As noted earlier, several programs such as A.C.T.I.O.N.'79 and the NCLS programs have attempted to obtain recognized formal educational credits for their courses. In the 1979 A.C.T.I.O.N. program, an outline of the educational value of the course was presented to the local education board in an effort to obtain school credits in Outdoor Education. The credit, if attained, would have served as a formal recognition of their

45

accomplishment. (see Appendix N for a sample outline of the educational credit proposal). A credit was considered warranted if the youth successfully completed the program and received his certificate from the program staff. The board, however, could not reach a consensus in favour of granting a credit for the experiential/therapeutic program.

The resistance of most institutional education centers to recognize alternative means of creditation has been well documented by such individuals as Liazos (1978), Silvernail (1977), Strom (1975), and Theobald (1977). Liazos (1978) has gone so far as to state that the present "training" institutions are largely to blame for the success and failure of society. He also suggests that traditional schools are largely to blame for delinquency; they condition people for alienation and subservient or authoritarian roles which fit in well with the work force environment.

Nevertheless, education is probably considered the foundation for future technology and science. But, it has only been a few educators such as Gibbons and Hopkins (1980), Liazos (1978), Petzoldt (1975), Theobald (1977) and a handful of others who have argued that schools have an obligation to cause students to explore divergent ideas and areas as a means for continuing open dialogue, and to provide students with the necessary skills for personal growth. Education, as Shane (1973) noted, should involve health, vocational learning, leisure, community decision-making, as well as employ paracurriculums--training outside the academic setting. Hence, we need to spread education out, as well as recognize the limitations of the present formal educational structure.

Perhaps it is because of the difficulty in identifying the meaning of education that those involved in wilderness adventure programs leave the assumptions upon which the programs are founded unarticulated and the psychological/therapeutic aspects to appear implicit, yet unchallenged. Therefore, the model used to explain the relationship between the educational value and psychosocial benefits of such programs is only meant to be functional. That is, the humanistic eclectic behavioral approach tries to contribute to the general Gestalt--overall understanding--of the program without assuming any causal relations.

Humanistic _Eclectic_ _Behavioral_ _Approach_. In keeping with the Outward Bound ideology, and previous findings, program A.C.T.I.O.N. implicitly had assumed that the program is an effective means of discovering oneself and offering direction for personal growth as well as in reducing juvenile delinquency. The probationers and staff in the 1978 project appeared to share this belief, and theories on the development of personality maintain that a positive view of oneself is a prerequisite for maturity, including nondelinquent behavior (Jesness, 1972; Rogers, 1970). Having the belief alone can help to make the wilderness experience meaningful and effective; in essence a self-fulfilling prophecy. Most students who attend regular outdoor survival programs do so with the image that they "will change" in a positive direction as a result of the experience (Outward Bound Brochure, 1979; Rice, 1979). The general changes can include developing physical strength, developing leadership or team-work ability, and for juvenile groups, such as those sent by their probation officer, to be "rehabilitated" through the structured environment provided.

These generalizations of personal changes can, however, be related to a theoretical basis as Kelly and Baer (1968), Arthur (1975), and Porter (1975) have attempted to do in order to provide a working model. Many of the juveniles attending wilderness training programs talk continually, to each other, about their toughness, their risk taking abilities, and the ease with which they will handle the supposed challenges. These discussions tend to dominate the first few days at camp. Much of their talk is merely bravado, but as Arthur (1975) proposed, it also reflects a need for excitement and challenge or "adventure", as Hopkins (1976) suggests, and it is exactly that which the outdoor experiences typically offer. The structure of the A.C.T.I.O.N. program was no exception as it, too, attempted to challenge the delinquents' demand for excitement and impulsivity. Arthur (1975) further noted that accomplishment while interacting in small groups, in an isolated area, involving new activities, new skills, new social relationships under conditions which demand team-work, cooperation and patience have the potential to make a person not only feel good (as measured by self-esteem scales) about themselves, but also to make them feel a concrete sense of control and achievement. As Berube (1975) argued: "success breeds success" and a strong sense of self-sufficiency can be derived from the realization of mastery. And as noted earlier, Kelly and Baer (1968) have discussed how an outdoor experience program can offer boys an opportunity to establishing an identity and self-respect, perhaps even serve as a form of "rite-de-passage".

Among the dependent variables studied in relation to potential growth have been increased self-concept, new awareness of personal capabilities, peer relationships, initiative, increased social skills and for the adjudicated delinquents, recidivism. The slightly humanistic behavioral approach is one possible theoretical explanation that can be used to explain the effects of a survival program. The essential component is that "consequences for behavior are immediate and that they be usually positive in nature" (Arthur, 1975: 6). The wilderness experience is ideal for the behavior modification analogy because in view of the fact that a whole new set of behaviors or responses to new tasks are subject to shaping through positive and negative reinforcements. Then, using (psychological) measurement techniques, one can assess whether the associations between the independent variable(s) are related to performance and/or attitudinal changes considered of relevance to the hypotheses. As Arthur (1975: 6) observed: "everyone gets through the experience and how they fare is usually quite measureable." The critical question, however, is: how long does the change last and under what conditions?

Porter (1975: 18) was somewhat premature in asserting that a behavior modification program implies: "1) an individual program for each youth which would be too difficult to implement..., and 2) the overall goal of developing an emancipated youth would be difficult to maintain because adults would be required to employ contingencies." For example, in reference to the first point, social behaviorists such as Bandura and Walters (1963) and Bandura (1969), were among the first to observe that an individual can learn something just by watching someone else. This process has been referred to as "modelling" or "imitation" learning or "no-trial" learning. In reference to Porter's second point regarding the use of contingencies, the structure of a wilderness challenge program is such that natural reinforcements are built in. The staff merely provide additional reinforcement and provide the directives for the experience. Important is the fact that the behavior can be observed and manipulated (Adams, 1974).

Therefore, unlike most traditional behavior modification programs designed for delinquents, the A.C.T.I.O.N. program did not attempt to directly manipulate each and every deviant behavior and attitude that may have been learned. Rather, the program was structured so that if the probationers were going to overcome the course tasks they would be required to adopt those behaviors and attitudes which tend to be conducive to co-operation, initiative, effort, responsibility, respect for authority, trust, and individual self-esteem. Behavior modification in this context thus becomes: "the systematic application of proven principles (wilderness activities) of conditioning and learning in the remediation of human problems" (Milan & McKee, 1974: 746).

The human element of the program is dependent upon the type of staff, milieu setting, and realization that delinquency is a product of a *variety* of problems. In light of this situation an eclectic approach was chosen to deal with the youths, and for understanding the procedures. Such an approach was first advanced by the famed John Hopkins' psychiatrist Adolph Meyer (Ruch & Zimbardo, 1971). The eclectic approach, as Ruch and Zimbardo (1971: 642) note, is a flexible technique which allows freedom "from theoretical dogmatism in attempting to fit the therapy to the problem--not the patient to the therapists' theory." Since the staff are not capable of devising programs for each individual, and because they in large lack the professional skills to act as a therapist, the staff must learn to utilize their environment to facilitate the delinquents' ability to abstract the consequences of their behavior beyond the immediate event (Golins, 1975). The staff should be able to present the task and conduct the debriefing sessions in such a manner that the youth is able to reflect upon his behavior. Golins (1975) also outlined a number of staff communication traits which aid in promoting a more useful therapeutic environment between client and staff. Although appearing simplistic, they are very important. Some of the staff communication and orientation traits as adapted from Golins (1975: 5-8) include:

1. Being an interventionist--whether it be confrontively, empathetically, genuinely, self-disclosing, or a combination thereof.
2. Being available for talk.
3. Being straight forward--sarcasm and 'bull slinging' is what they are used to; they do not need any more of it.
4. Being able to 'expect the unexpected' because one is often exposed to new behavior patterns which may demand more self-responsibility than most are often use to.

In addition to employing the proper communication skills and having a sound teaching knowledge, the staff need to have a thorough understanding and command of the (A.C.T.I.O.N.) process in order to properly provide an experiential learning environment.

Therefore, since wilderness programs, such as A.C.T.I.O.N., are designed to impel willing participants to acquire mastery over a variety of challenging problems/tasks, both independently and as a group, they can be considered to represent an experiential learning environment under the guise of a behavioral setting. And because A.C.T.I.O.N. was designed so that all participants would successfully resolve the tasks, it was important that they should be presented in a constructive manner. Golins (1975) has defined the structure of such programs as follows:

1. prescriptive--based on the needs of the student and staff,
2. progressive--learning is sequential,
3. concrete--the participants know what they are up against,
4. manageable--make sure people can master the tasks
5. worthwhile--involve elements of emotional, mental, and physical risks,
6. reconstructive--problems able to be related to the clients natural urban environment, and
7. holistic--problems are such that probationers in overcoming them realize their potential in different areas.

In summary, the aim of A.C.T.I.O.N. was to give the probationers freedom to develop positive psychosocial behaviors and attitudes to the wilderness adventure tasks. It did not attempt to uncover and manipulate old behaviors directly, but rather to present varying opportunities, often demanding different styles of coping which, when combined with the debriefings and peer interaction and other traits as outlined above, might initiate a new awareness and consequently desire for a new behavior. In order to maximize this eclectic approach an apparent informal setting has to be understood and manipulated in such a manner as to create a therapeutic wilderness setting.

Therefore, the ideology of A.C.T.I.O.N. was two-pronged. It was meant to: (a) be educational by presenting the probationers with new outdoor skills and knowledge, and (b) be therapeutic by providing the youths with an opportunity for personal growth and a chance to modify their less desirable behaviors and replace them with more socially acceptable ones based on a behavioral model. In this way, through the interaction of an experiential-therapeutic-educational wilderness environment, the youth could develop realistic self-expectations. Finally, this idealogical approach is considered superior to traditional alternatives of aversive treatments because of its premises, probation included. To quote Porter (1975: 34)...

> The result should be peer group participation in problem solving in the novel environment with the consequent development of (improved self-concept, improved school/work behavior, and reduced involvement with delinquent behavior) based on the individual and group success in coping with the demands of the wilderness.

E. Review of Wilderness Survival Training Programs

> Far better it is to dare mighty things, to win glorious triumphs, even though checkered with failure, than to rank with those poor spirits who neither enjoy much nor suffer much, because they live in the grey twilight that knows not victory nor defeat.
>
> Theodore Roosevelt.

Wilderness survival training programs have received considerable recognition and coverage in the media, both in terms of sensational wilderness experiences, and more importantly, in terms of their presumed psychological and behavioral benefits such as promoting social-acceptance (Smith et al., 1975), improving self-concept (Lemire, 1975), reducing recidivism (Hileman, 1979; Kelly & Baer, 1968; Maynard, 1969), and for some, improving a number of interpersonal skills (Baer et al., 1975; Behar & Stephens, 1978; Porter, 1975).

The programs, in general, contribute their course effects to the type of environmental setting provided which: (a) offers both physical and mental challenges as well as adventure, and (b) offers experiential education which is directed to promoting personal growth and identity (Golins, 1975). Individual growth is attempted by impelling (willing) participants to overcome a series of unique problem solving tasks, with few artifacts, in a natural environment, in a struggle for survival. Uniquely, the wilderness training programs emphasize high impact and stress-directed involvement which demands that the individual excel beyond which they believed they were capable. This would seem appropriate for juveniles, as one of the underlying assumptions of the present study was that by participating in the A.C.T.I.O.N. program the delinquent's self-concept and self-esteem would improve and that he would adopt a more socially acceptable mode of behavior such as keeping out of further trouble (Mazur, 1978).

The course activities in Outward Bound or adapted programs usually consist of individual and group challenges, such as mountain climbing, rappelling, wilderness canoeing, map and compass work, long hikes and various assortments of low and high initiative tasks which might include pole climbing, solos and group debriefs (see Appendix G for a description of some of these variables). The experiences are designed to push people to stretch their perceived potentials to even broader boundaries--as in "rite-de-passage" ordeals. Over the years, however, numerous programs have been developed with the general philosophies of the original Outward Bound being modified in terms of the type of clientele, structure and duration of programs, specific course objectives, and type of staffing. In addition to the variety of different programs, various programs have conducted an array of different evaluations with varying results.

The purpose of this section is to present an overview and summarize a variety of the studies reviewed which met one or more of the following criteria:

1. Evaluations of intervention programs based on the adapted Outward Bound models.
2. Evaluations that represent a cross-section of clientele, i.e., juveniles, emotionally disturbed youth, college students, and those attending special courses for professional men and women.
3. Evaluations that attempt to either empirically and/or subjectively quantify psychological, sociological and/or behavioral changes attributable to the program.
4. Evaluations that reflect variations in objectives and duration of Outward Bound type programs.
5. Evaluations that contribute to an international scope, allowing for a comparative analysis.

The criteria were chosen so as to provide not only a chronological review, but also an examination of variability in designs, theory, program objectives and measurements upon which: (a) theoretical and methodological limitations and critique of the evaluation studies can be based, and (b) upon which the present evaluation study can be premised.

Due to the number of studies reviewed and their varying quality only a representative sample of the more substantive reports will be represented. For a complete summary of the empirical studies selected for review refer to Table 2.

Shortly after Outward Bound appeared in the United States, a pilot project for five adjudicated delinquents from Massachusetts was run at the Colorado Outward Bound School. The following year, in 1965, the Division of Youth Services of Massachusetts sent forty more boys to Outward Bound schools in Colorado, Minnesota, and Maine. In order to assess the viability of the programs, Kelly and Baer (1968) were contracted to determine whether Outward Bound could serve as a practical alternative to the traditional training school environment being employed at the time for young (ages 15-17) adjudicated delinquents of the state.

The comparison group of sixty adjudicated youths were selected from the same institutional population as the experimental group. But, the comparison group was treated in the routine manner. The selection criteria included age (15-17), absence of physical disabilities, absence of severe psychopathology (i.e., psychosis), phobias of height, water, etc... as determined by the clinical data in available files, and absence of severely retarded boys--a minimum I.Q. score of 70 was established.

The experimental and comparison groups were initially matched at the time of selection for the study on age, race, religion, offense for which they were committed, area of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2A

Summary of Wilderness Adventure Programs

	N	Location	Target Group	Target Behavior Objectives	Control Group	Participation Observation	Psychological Scales
Baer et al. 1975	60	USA	adjudicated delinquents	recidivism and behav. rating	60	no	no
Behar and Stephens 1978	46	USA	emotionally disturbed	personal adjust. school, leisure del. activity	no	no	yes
Beker 1960	261	USA	grade 6 students	"social &, emotional growth"	96	no	yes
Berube 1975	6	CDN	emotionally disturbed and delinquent boys	functional behavior	yes ?	no	yes
Birkenmayer & Polonoski 1973	78	CDN	training school wards	recidivism and post release performance	use general comparison	no	yes
Birkenmayer and Polonoski 1975	100	CDN	training school wards	recidivism and school/work experience	no use compar. GRD	interview	no
Brown and Simpson 1977	10	USA	delinquent	recidivism self-confidence	no	no	yes
Clifford and Clifford 1977	36	USA	adolescent delinquents	behavior, self-concept	no	no	yes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2A (continued)

	N	Location	Target Group	Target Behavior Objectives	Control Group	Participation Observation	Psychological Scales
Dewdeney and Miner 1974	84	AUST.	young adults	recidivism, work release performance	42	yes	yes
Fletcher 1970	300	ENG.	lay participants	self-esteem learning	no	yes	yes(?)
Heilman 1979	96	USA	delinquents	personality, recidivism	48	no	yes
Hobbs & Shelton 1972	9	USA	emotionally disturbed, adolescent outpatients	interpersonal skills, cooper. functional skills	no	yes	no
Kaplan 1974	35	USA	young high school students	self-esteem	25	yes	yes
Kelly 1974	-	USA	delinquents	recidivism, personal functioning	yes ?	-	-
Kelley and Baer 1968	120	USA	delinquents	recidivism	60	yes	yes
Kelley and Baer 1969	120	USA	delinquents	self-concept	60	no	yes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2A (continued)

	N	Location	Target Group	Target Behavior Objectives	Control Group	Participation Observation	Psychological Scales
Lemira 1975	40	CDN	High school	self-concept, perception, trust	18	no	yes
Matheson 1966	58	CDN	delinquents	recidivism	yes	no	no
Maynard 1969	-	USA	two program: slum youths, delinquents	recidivism, social adjustment	yes	yes	yes
Kragick 1978		USA	adjustment				
Partington 1977	77	CDN	delinquent, socially maladjusted	develop more personal control	yes 36	no	yes
Polonoski 1976	15	CDN	training school wards	recidivism, school/work performance	no	interview	no
Porter 1975	178	USA	problem youth, economically deprived	develop responsibility and trust	yes 20	yes	yes
Smith et al. 1975	620	USA	young people	self-concept self-sesteem self-awareness self-assertion accept. of others	no	yes	yes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2A (continued)

	N	Location	Target Group	Target Behavior Objectives	Control Group	Participation Observation	Psychological Scales
Thorvaldson and Matheson 1978	197	CDN	young adults	recidivism	yes 86	yes	yes
William and Chun 1973	300	USA	adjudicated delinquents	recidivism	yes	no	no
Winter and Winter 1966	12	USA	emotionally disturbed	self-image respect and recreation	no	yes	yes

Note: Positive results indicate that the program was seen as an effective "treatment" alternative in accordance with the program goals. Negative results indicate that the program was seen as not an effective "treatment" alternative.

* Indicates general direction of the findings.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2B

	Staff evaluation	multi-measure	follow-up	type of article	length of program	results	
						positive	negative
Baer et al. 1975	yes	yes	1 yr.	empirical	27 day	*	
Behar and Stephens 1978	no	yes	several months	empirical	approx. 1 yr.	*	*
Beker 1960	yes	yes	four months	empirical	five days	*	
Berube 1975	no	yes	two-three months	empirical	six days	* but eval. incomplete	
Birkenmayer and Polonoski 1973	yes	yes	one year	empirical	eight weeks		has no recommendations
Birkenmayer and Polonoski 1975	no	yes	three-thirteen months	description	-		*"depended on preparedness to cope in comm."
Brown and Simpson 1977	yes	yes	yes ?	empirical and description	42 days	* "conditional"	
Clifford and Clifford 1967	yes	yes	no	empirical	one month	* changes general rather than specific * changes	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2B (continued)

	Staff evaluation	multi-measure	follow-up	type of article	length of program	results positive	results negative
Dewdney and Miner 1974	yes	yes	one year	empirical	twenty-six days	*but requires further testing"	
Fletcher 1970	yes	yes	yes	empirical	one year	*	
Heilman 1979	no	yes	seven months	empirical	three weeks	*	
Hobbs and Shelton 1972	no	no	no	empirical	five day	*	
Kaplan 1974	no	yes	six months	empirical	fourteen days	*	
Kelly 1974	-	-	ten years	review	-	*need community follow-up	
Kelly and Baer 1968	yes	yes	nine months	empirical	twenty-seven days	*	
Kelly and Baer 1969	no	yes	one year	empirical	twenty-seven days	*	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

x

TABLE 2B (continued)

	Staff evaluation	multi measure	follow-up	type of article	length of program	results positive	 negative
Lemire 1975	no	yes	three seeks	empirical	to weeks	*"but needs better design"	
Matheson 1966	no	no	six to twenty-two months	empirical	four months	*"but needs more time"	
Maynard 1969	yes	yes	yes ?	review and empirical	twenty-six days	*for both programs	
Kragick 1978 Partington 1977	yes	yes	eleven months	empirical	twenty-five days divided into 3 5 days and 1 10 day		*number of program problems
Polonski 1976	no	yes	three-thirteen months	descriptive	-		* depends on preparedenss to cope in community.
Porter 1975	yes	yes	six weeks	empirical	three weeks	*	
Smith et al. 1975	no	yes	no	empirical	three weeks	*except self-awareness	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2B (continued)

	Staff evaluation	multi-measure	follow-up	type of article	length of program	results positive	 negative
Thorvaldson and Matheson 1978	no	no	three years	empirical	one month	* "in terms of compared recidivism	
William and Chun 1973	no	no	seven to fourteen months	empirical	six weeks	*	
Winter and Winter 1966	no	yes	no	empirical	nine weeks	*but many considerations re staff and techniques of courses	

Note: Positive results indicate that the program was seen as an effective "treatment" alternative in accordance with the program goals.
Negative results indicate that the program was seen as an effective "treatment" alternative.

* Indicates general direction of the findings.

residence and number of prior commitments to the Division of Youth Services. Initial chi-square tests showed no significant differences between the two groups.

The focus of Kelly and Baer's (1968) study was two fold. The primary interest was to determine if the wilderness experience was more effective than a training school placement in reducing further delinquent behavior after release from either disposition. Secondly, their study examined the general contentions that Outward Bound programs can help adjudicated juveniles by presenting them with tasks that have positive effects on the participants attitudes, self-concept and general perceptions about themselves and others.

For the sixty youths in the Outward Bound program, the study disclosed that, based on the Jesness Inventory (a personality inventory), and a semantic differential self-concept measure, there was a statistically significant improvement immediately after the course on six (autism, alienation, asocialization, manifest aggression, social maladjustment and value orientation) of the eleven scales of the Jesness Inventory and on three of the ten self-concept scales. The comparison group was not administered either of the tests. From the results of the tests Kelly and Baer (1969: 719) concluded that "Outward Bound is a desirable short term means of promoting positive change in the social attitudes and self-concept of male delinquents."

With respect to the reduction of further delinquency which was ascertained by reviewing records of court appearances, Kelly and Baer (1971) found that one year after parole or completing the program, the experimental group had a recidivism rate of 20 percent, while the comparison group had a recidivism rate of 42 percent. A chi-square analysis showed that the results were significant. Kelly (1974) considered the 1971 findings to be very respectable when compared to the recidivism rates of the long-term residential training schools which were approximating the national average of 50-60 percent.

In addition to reporting recidivism rates Kelly and Baer (1971), using chi-square tests, identified four demographic variables as being related to recidivism. The variables included: 1) age of first court appearance--the earlier the appearance the less effective the program, 2) presence of both parents in the home--if they were at home lower recidivism rates were found, 3) institutionalization--the program was more effective if the participant had at least one prior commitment to a training school, and 4) types of offenses--recidivism was lower for those who acted out in the community rather than at home.

Furthermore, Kelly and Baer (1968) observed that the Outward Bound experience was more economical than an average 9 to 12 month stay at an institutional setting. The average cost to send a youth to the 27-day Outward Bound program was approximately $600, or $22.00 per day, while it cost between $3-4,000, or $19.00 per day, to maintain a juvenile in an insitition for a year.

In a five year follow-up report, Kelly (1974: 9) noted that for the youths involved in the Outward Bound course, chi-square analysis indicated that "while the difference in recidivism still favors the Outward Bound group, it is no longer statistically significant" (38% vs. 53%). Interestingly, Kelly noted that the greatest increase in recidivism for the experimental group occurred at the end of the second year after leaving the course. This was not the case with the comparison group whose recidivism rate stabilized after the first year. The comparison groups results are consistent with data reported by other researchers as well in that 80% of the recidivism occurs within the first year after "treatment" or release (Carlson, 1973; Gendreau & Leipciger, 1978). Based on the experimental group's recidivism results and the related demographic variables as reported by Kelly and Baer in 1971, Kelly (1974) suggests that Outward Bound had an effect on some delinquents, sufficient to help them from becoming involved with the law for longer periods of time than traditional alternatives.

Using data from the 1968 project by Kelly and Baer, Baer et al. (1975), in a post hoc analysis, reported that the awarding of a certificate to youths successfully completing the program also correlated with the nonrecidivism data after the five year follow-up. They showed that instructors' ratings were a useful measure for predicting future success. That is, if the staff felt the juvenile had performed well and had learned something, then his chances of success would be better. Specifically, Baer et al. (1975) found that three scales; maturity, leadership and effort, significantly correlated with success upon release. They also found that nine of every ten delinquents who failed to receive a certificate was eventually returned to prison or training school within the five year period.

While many less sophisticated studies have been performed in the United States and elsewhere, of the nearly 1,000 adaptive programs that have been implemented since Kelly and Baer's work, they have, despite varying qualities of evaluations, collectively added to the face validity. In general, however, they have served as discovery reports rather than confirmatory evaluations (i.e., Brown & Simpson, 1975; Gomolak, 1973; Krajick, 1978; Rice, 1979). For example, since 1968 some of the different adaptive Outward Bound programs that have been instituted have been specifically for juvenile offenders (Hileman, 1979; Kelly & Baer, 1968; Mazur, 1978; Willman & Chun, 1973). Other adaptive Outward Bound programs have been for drug users (Ventura & Dundon, 1974); as an alternative for young adult offenders (Dewdney & Miner, 1975; Thorvaldson & Matheson, 1973); as an alternative to traditional education (Brown & Simpson, 1975; Maynard, 1969; Nold & Wilpers, 1975); as a mechanism for human development and understanding (Gomolak, 1973), and for other assorted groups which have a need to learn through experience and cooperation with others (Porter, 1975; Rice, 1979).

However, a number of more sophisticated evaluations have been undertaken to obtain more accurate assessments of psychological and behavioral effects of survival training courses since Kelly and Baer (1968). Therefore, the remainder of this section will be divided into two sections: recidivism studies and studies employing psychological or related measures. They will serve to meet the initial criteria as well as support, or not support, Kelly and Baer's (1968) work, which for many researchers in the area, has been the focal point for their review.

Recidivism Studies. Matheson (1966), studying the "long-term" effects of recidivism (defined as rate of reincarceration) on "hard-core" offenders (defined as youth displaying hostile acting-out aggressive behavior and manipulative or unresponsive behavior) found that for the 58 out of 149 who did successfully complete their training, and who had been discharged from the camp, "only twenty have returned to gaol, a significant figure in view of the high risk category involved." His follow-up period varied from six to twenty-one months. Matheson concluded by suggesting that the success rate of 68.4 percent was promising when compared to the 44 percent success rate for hard-core delinquents released from a maximum security insitution, and that such a program could serve as viable alternative in dealing with hard-core offenders.

Similar support for "less serious" delinquent offenders has come from Maynard (1969) who found that after a year follow-up only 20 percent of the juveniles had been reincarcerated. Maynard's findings were almost identical to those of Kelly and Baer (1971) and Willman and Chun (1973) who employed a similar dependent variable, rate of reincarceration, and used a similar follow-up period of about one year for their sample of adjudicated delinquents.

Meanwhile, Dewdney and Miner (1974), and Thorvaldson and Matheson (1973) measured the recidivism rate (official rate of reincarceration and/or parole board action), of young adults (ages 16-35) who had completed an adapted Outward Bound course. Unfortunately, the research of Dewdney and Miner was left uncompleted as no recidivism data was collected due to political complications. Their initial data, however, suggested that the program had had a positive short-term benfit on the attendants' attitudes and interpersonal behaviors as measured by a self-report questionnaire.

Thorvaldson and Matheson (1973) compared two programs in which the 197 participants, ages 16-21 (first offenders), were selected on a number of criteria which included: total sentence not being more than 36 months, being physically fit, serving their first ("non-trivial") sentence in an adult institution, emotionally stable and a few other factors. The key difference between the two programs was that the Haney Correctional Camp was a medium security institution and the four-month Boulder Bay camp a wilderness forest camp, based on similar principles as Outward Bound (see Thorvaldson and Matheson, 1973, for a program description).

The experimental group consisted of 111 participants and the comparison group of 86 young men. Selection for the two programs was based on a random procedure after a cohort of possible candidates had met the criteria for inclusion. If the criteria were met the decision for placement then rested on the flip of a card marked either Haney or Boulder Bay.

It was predicted that; (a) Boulder Bay would result in a lower percentage of violators--based on corrections' service records and a check of R.C.M.P. finger print files, (b) that the difference would be accounted for mostly by a difference in "major" violations--new convictions which resulted in a prison sentence of more than 90 days or revocation of parole, and (c) that the difference in violation rate would be greatest in the first year of the post-release period. The chi-square results indicated that the experimental group who graduated and were followed for three years, had a significantly lower recidivism rate than that of the comparison graduates (51.4% vs. 69.0%). The difference was accounted for entirely by the difference in major violations (26.1% vs. 46.6%). Based on the observations, Thorvaldson and Matheson suggested "the 18% better performance (of) the Boulder Bay group yields more than a 25% reduction of recidivism" and could therefore be considered a viable alternative for young adult offenders. The significant difference is dissipated, however, when the program graduates and drop-outs are combined and compared. While the Boulder Bay group still show a lower percentage of major violations, the results were no longer statisitically significant (23.4% vs. 39.5%). A further observation by Thorvaldson and Matheson lends support to Kelly and Baer (1968), in that they noted that a comparison of cost effectiveness of the two programs showed that Boulder Bay operated at considerable savings to that of the Haney Correctional Camp.

In keeping with recidivism findings, Wichmann (1979) reports a study by Cytrynbaum and Ken conducted in Connecticut (1975) who compared 49 adjudicated delinquents who attended a wilderness school to 54 similar boys who did not (comparison group). The participants were neither randomly assigned nor exactly matched on any variables. Cytrynbaum and Ken were interested in examining the long term impact on arrests, drug and alcohol abuse and system dependency. In their six-month follow-up analysis they found that the greatest difference in recidivism (official arrests) was 11.1% for the experimental group and 30.2% for the comparison group, which consisted of

82

delinquent youths matched on age, sex, race and type of offense. Similarly, Kimball (1979) reported a 17% recidivism rate (police contacts), for 56 juvenile graduates of a wilderness program after nine months of follow-up. No control or comparison groups were used, however.

Hileman (1979) used several measures for recidivism and found that after seven months 22.9% of the experimental group had recidivated as compared to 39.6% of the comparison group. His recidivism measures included petitions filed and/or charges laid over the follow-up period.

Not all the studies have reported favourable findings for the reduction of recidivism. Birkenmayer and Polonoski (1973, 1975) who have perhaps conducted the most extensive evaluation of an adapted wilderness program since Kelly and Baer (1968), have presented only tentative support for the effectiveness of a survival oriented program in Ontario. Relying on interviews, prior offense records, and personal background information, Birkenmayer and Polonoski (1973: 45) suggest that in light of Kelly and Baer's (1968) findings and observations "a goodly number of the boys sent to D.A.R.E. should not have been there." This was later supported by Golins (1975) when he suggested that a strict criteria for admission be established because such programs are not a panacea for all delinquents. For example, Birkenmayer and Polonoski's preliminary data suggested that the program was of little benefit, at least statistically, to the juveniles in attendenance at D.A.R.E. This was true even though 37 of the 42 program graduates had positive feelings (based on interview reports) about their experience.

The series of studies surrounding the two-month program showed that it was no more effective in reducing recidivism after one year, or in improving work or school behavior than for those leaving a training school environment. The recidivism rate was approximately 51 percent for both the experimental and comparison groups. The comparison group consisted of boys going through the training school system. The researchers suggested that the results were in part due to the fact that a majority of the boys were socially (i.e., parents had delinquent history in 33% of the cases), and intellectually incapable (68% had educational impediments and did not get beyond grade nine) of coping with such a physically and mentally demanding program. They offer a number of recommendations in their conclusion that reflect similar concerns to those of other researchers (Barcus & Bergeson, 1972; Kaplan, 1974; Partington, 1977). Some of the recommendations included using stricter screening procedures, improving staffing and course content, and employing an ongoing evaluation with appropriate follow-up periods.

Psychological and Related Measures. The key difference between the recidivism measures and most of the psychological measures is that the recidivism data involved varying follow-up periods while most other dependent measures employed only pre and posttest observations. That is, the psychological measures were usually premised on the strong logical evidence that if an "effect" occurred between the two measures that the effect could be attributed to the independent variable(s), in most cases the Outward Bound (adaptive) program.

Generally, the studies reviewed reported positive changes in behaviors and attitudes for a varied representation of the population. Kelly and Baer (1968) reported changes in self-concept and nondelinquent attitudes for juveniles, according to a self-concept scale and the Jesness Inventory. Hileman (1979) reported similar changes on seven scales of the Jesness Inventory (social maladjustment, value orientation, alienation, manifest aggression, immaturity, withdrawal, and repression); four of which were also reported by Kelly and Baer (1968), for juveniles attending a Michigan Outward Bound program; while Kimball (1979) reported positive changes on a number of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scales with his pre and posttest design. Porter (1975), using the Peirs-Harris Self-Esteem Measure and the Behavior Rating Form, observed significant positive changes for problem and emotionally deprived youths; while Smith et al. (1975), using a time-series design, observed significant changes on the sub-scales self-concept, self-assertion, self-esteem, and acceptance of others on their "Inventory of Outward Bound Effects", for 620 regular participants at the Colorado Outward Bound School.

Hobbs and Shelton (1972), while assessing changes in interpersonal skills, cooperation and functional skills of emotionally disturbed adolescent outpatients, through the use of staff reports and participant observations, concluded that there were "favourable changes" by the youths. Maynard (1969) found that youths from the "slum" (taken literally to imply absence of plumbing and heating, etc.) area could also benefit from a wilderness program, as he observed favourable changes in social adjustment of the experimental group when compared to a comparison group of similar slum youths. Lemire (1975), using a quasi-experimental design, measured positive changes with Rosenberg's Self-Concept and the Trust Scale for a group of 22 high-school students when compared to a quasi-control group of 18 youths; as did Berube (1975), who reported positive changes in self-esteem and social interaction based on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Burks Behavior Rating Scale with ten mentally retarded children.

A number of participant observation studies also purport positive changes in behavioral and attitudinal perceptions of outdoor adventure participants. For example, Gomolak (1973) discusses how delinquent and high school students' self-esteem and general perceptions changed in a visibly positive direction; while Krajick (1978), after participating in a three week adapted Outward Bound program in Florida for adjudicated delinquents, reported that the strenuous activities combined with staff counseling and need for group cooperation allowed him to witness obvious changes in the youths' physical stamina, self-confidence, respect towards authority and the need for cooperation. Similarly, Rice (1979), while participating in a special Outward Bound course for businessmen reported that he felt the course facilitated group discussion and in learning new coping techniques for handling stress and for improving decision-making procedures. Although these reports do not provide hard-core empirical evidence, they do add to the face validity that Outward Bound programs are adaptable to a varied representation of the population and that the benefits that can be derived from such programs include such wide concepts as personal growth, interpersonal growth and social adjustment.

In general, the findings point to the potential that an adaptive Outward Bound program may have as a behavioral change-agent for juvenile offenders and other types of populations. The above concept, however, does not contend to be a panacea for all delinquents, but rather it may be a viable alternative to mass institutionalization or probation. For instance, a number of the reviews for the various target groups have observed that even though most of the O.B. (adapted) studies rely on short-term goals, not all the studies reported positive findings. Arthur (1975) discusses how a number of adapted O.B. programs for delinquents did not report favourable findings in recidivism data; Barcus and Bergeson (1972) discuss the problems of how the programs are not always able to deal with youth experiencing emotional and learning disabilities, while Mondschein (1966-67) notes the staff are not always capable of handling handicapped children. And Berube (1975: 19) points out that "...to expect that the experiences gained during a week's camp would drastically change one's self-concept is perhaps not very realistic."

The issues surrounding a lack of support for the programs also include a varied array of extraneous variables often ignored in reports. Kaplan (1974) and Krajick (1978) note that staffing may be a critical factor in of a program's success, while Golins (1975) and Hopkins (1976) found that the degree of program intensity and adventure may be an influential factor. Arthur (1975) and Kaplan (1979) meanwhile report that the post community support may be critical to long-term effects, and Fletcher (1970) and Smith et al. (1975) suggest that the degree of staffing expertise across a wide range of skills and their actual degree of involvement may act as an extraneous influence on program effects. These studies all suggest that perhaps it is not the program per se that may contribute to any changes but a combination of other extraneous variables often left unmonitored.

Summary. The formal and impressionistic evaluations of the adapted Outward Bound programs collectively suggest that empirically and observationally the goals of such programs offer a feasible "therapeutic" environment for an assortment of clientele; from emotionally handicapped to juvenile delinquents. In addition, there appears to be tentative support for the contention that the programs facilitate personal and interpersonal growth, and for juveniles serves as a potential alternative with regard to reducing recidivism. However, even a number of the more sophisticated studies were plagued with design and methodological problems, such as sample sizes, criteria measures, limited follow-up periods for psychological and/or sociological variables such as recidivism, and a lack of clear definition of independent and dependent variables. These limitations will be elaborated in the following section.

F. Theoretical and Methodological Evaluation and Critique of Evaluative Studies for Adaptive Outward Bound Programs

The results of the research reviewed above, although not exhaustive, generally appear to present a positive picture for survival oriented programs. In observing the use of consistently similar research designs, however, a number of concerns and suggestions require consideration.

Arthur (1975), Barcus and Bergeson (1972), Partington (1977), Porter (1975), and Wichmann (1979) have all aptly observed that many of the outdoor programs evaluated lacked a clear definition of variables defining "survival training". Although most published studies are brief due to publication constraints, a more explicit classification of instructions, experiences, objectives, behaviors and attitudes comprising the programs are needed. Large variation in procedures may be found under the label of survival-oriented programs. For example, even though the A.C.T.I.O.N. and D.A.R.E. programs operated out of the same camp, the instructions and experiences varied markedly. The point is also evident when one looks at the different types of clientele and variation in program length. While the majority of programs follow a similar philosophy and course outline, the principles and context by which the courses were conducted varied dramatically from an emphasis on stress-challenge

(Hileman, 1979) to a behavior modification (Hobbs & Shelton, 1972) approach, to an eclectic approach employing humanistic techniques such as transactional analysis, group and self therapy (Porter, 1975). Therefore, variations in the experiences, instructions and composition of the programs alone may threaten the theoretical validity of the research and program, if they are not clearly defined.

Other weaknesses evident in a majority of the studies were the reliance on limited outcome measures, general research designs and the use of small sample sizes. Most of the studies evaluating juvenile wilderness programs used official recidivism defined as rate of reincarceration, as the sole criterion of success/failure (i.e., Matheson, 1966; Willman & Chun, 1973); while others consistently relied primarily on psychometric measures such as the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, Cattell's 16PF, Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale and a series of other measures which by themselves are of questionable validity, especially when they are only attitudinal scales (see, for example, Anastasi, 1976). Moreover, others relied on personal observations or participant observation reports (i.e., Gomolak, 1967; Krajick, 1978; Rice, 1979), which may serve as descriptive and exploratory data but provide no confirmatory evidence for some studies, while others being more empirically based, either failed to use a control or comparison group (i.e., Behar & Stephens, 1978; Beker, 1960; Fletcher, 1970; Hopkins, 1976), or didn't include any substantial follow-up to their initial observations (Berube, 1974; Clifford & Clifford, 1967; Porter, 1975). Finally, still others attempted to generalize their data to similar populations from small sample sizes, that were not randomly selected (i.e., Berube, 1974; Brown & Simpson, 1977; Kaplan, 1974).

Further weaknesses in research designs have been reflected of the general lack in effort by reseachers to consider such factors as cost efficiency, comparative efficiency to other alternatives or short versus long term effects. For example, Partington (1977) attributed part of his programs failure to the inability of supporting agencies to recognize the need for proper funding and cooperation with the wilderness project. In a time when correctional agencies appear to be concerned with finances, a cost efficiency analysis would seem to be one of the appropriate focuses. Yet only three of the studies reviewed (Kelly and Baer,, 1968; Kimball, 1979; and Thorvaldson and Matheson, 1973) make any mention of cost efficiency.

A third major concern, or weakness, observed in a majority of the projects was the lack of adequate comparison or control groups (i.e., Birkenmayer & Polonoski, 1973; Fletcher, 1970; Smith et al., 1975). A failure to use a control or a comparison group, matched on variables that may influence the internal validity, may lead to improper interpretation of the data. For example, in a time series design (or even a pre/post design) changes over several months may simply have been the result of maturation. Therefore, a control group is necessary to control for the possible extraneous effects. The use of a control group also permits stronger generalization from the data to the general population (Kerlinger, 1973).

The fourth major concern with the evaluations reviewed was the lack of attention paid to such extraneous variables as the type of clientele, degree of group or staff involvement, physical surroundings, recruitment of staff, cooperation and relationship with supporting agencies, if any, and the degree of harmony between the line staff and administration. These factors combined or independently may have an important impact on not only the outcome of the project, but also on the general operation of a course (i.e., Dewdney & Miner, 1975; Partington, 1977). It is, therefore, important to identify and define all relevant aspects of a program as they may either directly or indirectly influence the programs outcome. Although using only five studies in his evaluation, Wichmann (1979: 11) makes a similar observation: "Another threat to validity in all these (five) studies was the inability to completely standardize independent program variables and the inadequate assessment of program variables." Only recently have researchers called for description and explanation of independent program variables in wilderness programs (i.e., Golins, 1979).

Finally, although most of the studies relied on the philosophy of the parent Outward Bound program to justify their theoretical prespective(s), and hypotheses, a number of the studies (i.e., Birkenmayer & Polonoski, 1973; Kelly & Baer, 1968; Willman & Chun, 1973) failed to outline a theoretical perspective on how their hypotheses related to the program's objectives. For example, knowing whether a program reduces recidivism or not says little about how or why the programcan be considered causally related to the effect. For example, it may be a specific factor of the program, such as the type of staff, or the removal from influential friends that lead to the changes, not the concept of Outward Bound itself. One means of supporting a theoretical perspective is to specifically define program objectives and employ a control group(s) and provide a "multimodal assessment in order to lend consensual confidence to the observations of the dependent variables", and to clearly define the relationship between the independent and dependent variables (Wichmann, 1979: 13).

From the above discussion, the wilderness training programs for juvenile delinquents and other clientele would seem, to date, to provide only tenuous results. Consequently, a universal acceptance of the findings should not be made. Such weak evaluations make it difficult to assume a specific success of any or all programs simply because they are based on the Outward Bound principles. Nevertheless, as Arthur (1975) noted, there is an intuitive appeal about wilderness programs--fresh air, away from trouble and good clean fun--and since the majority of reports still suggest that the outdoor wilderness experience can serve as a potential milieu for youth of various types, we should attempt to improve our evaluation designs and procedures before we make any rash decisions about the true status of the alternative. Even though it may be that no significant differences in self-concept or behavior can be found between an experimental and control group over such a short period of time (see Berube, 1975), it does not necessarily preclude that the programs serve as a therapeutic modality. For example, Berube (1975: 19) notes that "self-concept is the outcome of a lifetime's experiences."

The evaluation of A.C.T.I.O.N. '79, in Ontario, was developed with many of the above critcisms in mind. Although obviously any single study could not be the definitive of all previous evaluations, evaluations, it has attempted to address a number of the shortcomings noted in their review. The history, purpose and design of the A.C.T.I.O.N. program follow in the subsequent sections.

G. A.C.T.I.O.N. 1978

Project A.C.T.I.O.N. (Accepting Challenge through Interaction with Others and Nature) was developed in the summer of 1978 under the auspicies of the Kitchener Probation/Aftercare Office, primarily through the efforts of one of the probation officers, Mr. Mazur. The program was designed to provide a 10-day therapeutic wilderness adventure experience for youths under the supervision of temporary probation staff. (See Appendix H for an outline of the program and its activities). By participating, probationers could be exposed to uniform supervision and assessment by staff. The staff appraisals, in turn, would allow the probation officer to see how their client performed throughout the program. Impending on the staff evaluations, the probation officer could plan for future directions that would benefit the boys.

The program was in part inspired by the well established D.A.R.E. program which had already been servicing training school wards since the early seventies. The available facilities of the D.A.R.E. project made it an ideal site for the A.C.T.I.O.N. program. The D.A.R.E. program was also fundamental in contributing to the A.C.T.I.O.N. structure and curriculum.

Briefly, the primary objectives of the program included building the probationers' self-esteem, improve interpersonal communication skills, help the youths to be more self-reliant and to also offer them a new recreational experience. (See the following section, "A.C.T.I.O.N. '79", for elaboration of the objectives).

The pilot program appeared to be a success from several points of view. First, the cost of running the program proved to be very reasonable when compared to probation supervision. The entire summer, including staff wages amounted to less than $2900; approximately $6.50 per diem. (See Table 3 for a breakdown of program expenditures in 1978 and 1979). Secondly, based on the staff evaluations, campers' verbal feedback, and supporting letters from probation officers, the boys appeared have both enjoyed the program as well as learned to respect authority and work together with others. And thirdly, the recommendations that were obtained from the staff at the end of the summer tended to be supportive of the program. For example, it was recommended that the program be extended from ten days to twenty-one, so as to provide greater opportunity for the youths to grow and become more aware of themselves as well as enable the staff to establish stronger bonds and hence a better working relationship with the probationers. It was also suggested that a longer program would allow the staff to emphasize certain activities perceived by the staff and clients as being beneficial and interesting. And most importantly perhaps, it was strongly recommended that the program should incorporate some

97

well designed evaluation procedures in an attempt to objectively ascertain the effect of the program on a short and long term basis. (see Mazur's 1978 evaluation report for a summary of all eighteen recommendations).

Consequently, based on the initial positive feedback and the promising report, program A.C.T.I.O.N. '79 received funding for the following year.

H. A.C.T.I.O.N. 1979

> Travel a thousand miles by train and you are a brute;
> pedal five hundred on a bicycle and you remain basically
> bourgeois; paddle a hundred in a canoe and you are
> already a child of nature.
>
> Pierre Trudeau.

In light of the apparent success of the 1978 pilot therapeutic-wilderness adventure program, an expanded version, based on the 1978 recommendations, was implemented for the 1979 summer program. The 1979 program was based on a 21-day experiential high-risk high adventure philosophy involving thirty male probationers (ages 13-16) from Kitchener-Waterloo and surrounding areas. An additional thirty male probationers matched for prior offenses, terms of probation, desire and ability to attend the camp, as well as physical and mental stability served as the control group.

The structure of the program involved both an expansion of activities (see Appendix I for a detailed outline of a sample course), as well as an extension of the evaluation procedures. The expansion of activities allowed for better acquisition of skills and more varied presentation of risk and adventure tasks. It also facilitated the opportunity for staff and students to interact, develop a deeper sense of trust, realize the need for cooperation, and desire to do well. The extended program also allowed for a more detailed and objective evaluation. Self-concept and other personality measures were used for both the control and experimental group to assess any change over time between the two groups after experiencing, or not experiencing the A.C.T.I.O.N. program. A number of questionnaires were incorporated to assess the effects of the courses as seen by significant others, including the participants parent(s) and probation officers, plus a self-evaluation. The questionnaires were also used to gather and compare socio-biographical information that could be used to form a typology at a later date, if any significant observations were made. For those involved in the experimental group, a staff evaluation form was completed for each participant. The staff also handed in a written evaluation about the program at the end of the summer.

Program Objectives

The objectives as presented in the 1979 proposal by Mazur (1979: 2-3) were as follows:

1. The main purpose was to improve the probationer's self-esteem and self-concept by providing innovative, challenging and adventurous activities. In developing a

pride in the youth's new abilities it was hoped that he might carry them back into the community.

2. To develop an improved relationship with his peers based on the major philosphy of the program--teamwork.
3. To help the boys accept and understand the role of authority figures. During the twenty-one-day program, the probationers would be interacting with their instructors on a 24-hour basis.
4. To help delinquent adolescents be more self-reliant. The youths were required to participate in all activities and throughout the session were taught various survival and technical skills.
5. To offer a recreation program for youths living in an urban environment. Most of the activities provided new experiences for the probationers. In essence, the program provided experiences of adventure and challenge in the wilderness as compared to the sidewalk and pinball arcades of the city.

Purpose of Study

Based on previous research and theories (i.e, Arthur, 1975; Kaplan, 1974; Kelly & Baer, 1968; Mazur, 1978; Porter, 1975) dealing with adapted wilderness adventure-therapeutic programs for adjudicated juveniles, the following propositions were formulated:

Proposition 1: There would be no significant differences between either the experimental or control group on the pre-measures of the Self-Esteem Measure, Jesness Inventory, or a number of the biographical and systemic variables which included: school attendance, age, types of offense records, and duration of probation. If these observations hold true then stronger inferences can be drawn from any differences between the groups (Kerlinger, 1973).

Proposition 2: Following exposure of the experimental group to the A.C.T.I.O.N. program, there would be significant differences on the standardized Self-Esteem Measure at the post and follow-up time intervals between the two groups.

Proposition 3: The higher one scored on the Self-Esteem Measure, the lower the probability one will engage in future delinquent activities.

Proposition 4: Exposure to the A.C.T.I.O.N. program leads to greater improvement in self-esteem sub-scale scores at the post and follow-up testing periods (i.e., Kelly & Baer, 1968; Porter, 1975; Simpson & Brown, 1974).

Proposition 5: The greater the shift toward nondelinquent attitudes the lower the probability that one will engage in future delinquent behaviors.

Proposition 6: Exposure to the A.C.T.I.O.N. program will facilitate the shift in attitudes toward nondelinquent norms, as expressed by the Jesness Inventory, when compared to the control groups (Hileman, 1979; Kelly & Baer, 1971).

Proposition 7: Therefore, exposure to the A.C.T.I.O.N. program will facilitate in the reduction of delinquent tendencies--that is, fewer acts that would be considered legal offenses and/or socially unacceptable will be reported.

Proposition 8: The interaction of the experimental group with the physical challenge program (A.C.T.I.O.N.) will help the participants improve in their expressed effort, peer relations, handling of authority, physical stamina, self-initiative, physical skills, and determination as assessed by a Students' Rating Form (Baer et al., 1975).

Proposition 9: Independent of the measures provided by the other forms, those boys participating in the wilderness program will perceive the program as more beneficial to them in reference to an educational tool as well as for refraining from future delinquent activities as compared to the control group. This will be ascertained through a self-report questionnaire upon completion of the program and in a follow-up self-report questionnaire.

Proposition 10: The follow-up forms to be completed by the experimental and control groups' respective parent(s), guardian(s), and probation officers will indicate that those youths who attended the outdoor program will fare better than those who did not. The criteria will include recidivism, school/work performance, family relationships, peer relationships and general attitude and behavior changes.

Main Theorem

Other things being equal, the A.C.T.I.O.N. program will serve to show that it is a viable alternative to placing youths on probation.

If the above hypotheses are supported, H. Kelly's (1970) statement of: "work hard and hope for a miracle too" would lend support to the humanistic eclectic behavioral approach, that guidance and support can help young people alter their negative perceptions and habits. Although the A.C.T.I.O.N. program is both physically and emotionally demanding, it offers physical and emotional attention, security and respect, independence, opportunity for healthy social interactions, and good models from adults and authority figures. (The extent to which the modification remains is a follow-up issue not a direct function of the program).

Dependent Variables. While most of the dependent variables are discussed in Appendicies A-F, K,L,M the variable recidivism rate deserves a brief clarification at this point as it will serve as a fundamental measure of long term success/failure in the evaluation.

Although recidivism rate, commonly defined as the official recording of an unlawful act by authorities, has been chosen as one of the criteria to measure program success/failure, there exists a growing body of literature that cautions against the use of such measurement. Bell (1974) noted that recidivism figures, usually based on official records, may not accurately reflect the effect of the program because it is "multidimensional", in that it may be affected by factors not connected with the program, such as post release adjustment or special help from a supporting agency or family member. Hood and Sparks (1970) draw attention to the general inaccuracy of recidivism figures available through official records. They noted that the "funneling" of cases happens in the process. For example, the recent report by the Solicitor General's research division (1979: 14) shows that only "1/17 of all break and enters result in conviction." Meanwhile, Cicourel (1976) dedicated several chapters to illustrating the problem, and demonstrated the low reliability of official data. More recently, Gendreau and Leipciger (1978: 3) suggest that recidivism is "one of the least understood measures employed in evaluation research." They noted that it has in part been due to the lack of consistency when defining what recidivism is meant to entail--complaints, convictions, or incarcerations. Gendreau and Leipciger (1978) further make the observation that recidivism rates do not necessarily need to relate to the success or failure of a rehabilitative program since reconviction may be a consequence of a personal defect beyond the program's control--extraneous variables. These observations were reiterated to some extent by Roesch and Corrado (1979) in their critique of a diversion evaluation project in the United States, which points out recidivism should not be used as a sole criterion. (See Waldo and Chiricos, 1977 for further discussion about multiple measures of recidivism).

Based on these observations, it was proposed to use self-reported delinquency and parental reports to assess recidivism in the present research design. This would complement Waldo and Chircos's (1977) suggestion by including multiple indicators of recidivism. Recidivism in the present study included arrests, police contact, reconviction and self-reported delinquency for which the probationer was not necessarily apprehended. The multiple indicators for recidivism do not imply a covariate relationship but will serve as a multiple comparison measure between the experimental and control group as Kelly (1974), and Kimball (1979) attempted to do. In addition, other factors such as self-concept, delinquent attitudes, school/work performance, and perception of significant others would be incorporated to provide a more holistic interpretation of the probationer's progress. (For example, see Roesch and Corrado's ,1979, discussion of a "multimodal" analysis procedure).

I. Method

Participants

The participants were sixty adjudicated males between the ages 13-16, placed on juvenile probation. Their offenses ranged from unlawful driving to theft over $200. The most frequently reported offenses were property related, with theft under $200 and Break and Enter the most common. Typically the youths came from lower-middle class standings (income less than $15,000), with both parents usually being involved in some kind of labour work. (Refer to Table 6 for a breakdown of the participants).

The participants were randomly divided into two equal groups of thirty. They were selected from a sample of approximately one hundred eligible candidates who were matched on age, sex, type of prior offense, school and family background, general location, and general emotional and physical health. The cohort was identified by having background information forms completed (see Appendix A) on all those juveniles having been placed on probation for the first time. One group represented the control and the other the experimental group. Those not placed in either group simply remained on probation without any further interference. All the boys who met

TABLE 3

Background Characteristics for Experimental (N=30) and Control Group (N=30)

Variables	Experimental Group Relative Frequency	Control Group Relative Frequency
School		
attending	93	93
not attending	7	7
Offence (reason for probation)		
assault	10	10
alcohol offence	3	3
auto theft	3	13
break and enter	30	23
intent to mislead	7	0
mischief	7	7
possession	13	0
robbery	0	3
theft under $200	20	37
theft over $200	3	3
unlawful driving	3	0
TOTAL	100	100
Probation Period		
six months or less	43	40
7-12 months	47	40
13-18 months	3	17
19-24 months	3	0
over 24 months	3	0
indefinite	3	3

Age	N	mean	range	N	mean	range
age (years)	30	14.8	14-16	30	14.7	13-15

the criteria for eligibility volunteered to attend.

The experimental group was in turn subdivided into three groups of ten boys, according to which session would be most convenient for them to attend. All the experimental participants were required to complete a number of forms including medical, parental consent, as well as a document expressing their willingness to participate after having been debriefed as to what the program would involve. All the participants were expected to bring some basic camping equipment (see Appendix B for a list of the equipment responsibilities and samples of the contract forms). The remaining necessities for the course were provided by project D.A.R.E.

None of the boys were forced to participate, however, in some instances a few needed last minute verbal encouragements.

Staffing

The four male staff were hired through Experience '79 as outdoor recreation officers. Three of the instructors were employed through the Kitchener Probation/Aftercare Office while the fourth was seconded from Project D.A.R.E. to act as a liason between the A.C.T.I.O.N. program and D.A.R.E., the base camp.

The staff were students, ranging in age from 21 to 25. One was completing a diploma in child work at a college, two were working on their senior level undergraduate requirements at university, while the fourth, who acted as head instructor and program co-ordinator, was completing graduate work in Criminology at Simon Fraser University. A Kitchener probation officer heavily participated in organizing and coordinating the operation from the base office. His responsibilities ranged from organizing food and transportation to assisting in screening applicants and staff.

The staff were fairly young, expressed a high degree of motivation, had a keen interest in working with young offenders and were therefore considered ideal candidates. The initial screening process for all the staff, except the head instructor and D.A.R.E. staff, was based on local applications submitted to the Kitchener Probation office. Qualifications being sought included applicants who indicated some experience with the outdoors, child work, senior level or bronze medal in swimming, reflecting an ability to handle responsibility and a genuine desire for employment, not so much for the monetary reward. The latter point was important because staff were paid minimum wage, $3.00 per hour, for a forty-hour week. In reality, however, they were expected to be on the job 24-hours a day for 21 consecutive days, with intermittent time periods off. The co-ordinator was hired through the office on the credentials of the 1978 program with which he was involved, as well as for his involvement in organizing and conducting the evaluation of the A.C.T.I.O.N. program.

Prior to the actual interview, all potential applicants were given a thorough account of what the program demanded from its staff, the financial situation, and the requirement of a two-week no pay training session before. In some cases, applicants decided against the opportunity. If they were still interested they were asked a number of questions related to their work experience, why they wanted to work for the program, and what they thought the program meant. Then they were asked to respond to a number of hypothical problems they might encounter. The interviews lasted approximately thirty minutes each.

Based on their responses to the potential problems, desire to work with juveniles, ability to handle responsibility, and outdoor skills, the staff were selected by the probation officer and head instructor. Upon officially being hired, all the staff were required to take an oath of confidentiality to protect the identity of the probationers.

Training Session

The instructors attended an intensive training session conducted by the D.A.R.E. camp. During the two weeks the staff were instructed in the physical skills needed, safety procedures such as water search and rescue techniques, as well as the basic philosophy and logistics of the program. Time was also spent teaching the new staff how to deal with the physical, emotional, and motivational problems which they might confront. All the staff were required to complete a sixteen hour condensed Saint John's First Aid Course. In addition, the D.A.R.E. liason member and head instructor completed the Basic Rescuer B.C.L.S. (pulminary heart resuscitation) course. Throughout the session the A.C.T.I.O.N. members spent time discussing the teaching and counselling methods to be used in their program, staff responsibilities, and organizing the summer timetable. They were also instructed on how to complete the Student Rating Form. Following the training period there was a two week period in which the staff could relax or refine any skills they thought necessary before the first group of probationers arrived. Thus by the time the official program was underway the staff were considered both physically and mentally prepared for the summer challenge ahead.

Measures

As illustrated in Table 5, a number of different measures were used to assess the criteria proposed in the program. The present section will discuss the personality measures, Staff Rating Form, and the five self-report questionnaires used in the study.

Personality Measures:

The Peirs-Harris Self-Esteem Measure (SEM) 80-item edition by Wing (1966), revised by Porter (1975) and again by the present researcher into a 90-item test, along with the 155-item Jesness Inventory (1972) were the two standardized tests used to evaluate the effect of the A.C.T.I.O.N. program.

The Jesness Inventory (JI) was chosen because of its appropriateness for juveniles. The JI is the result of a five year research program on delinquency in California during the 1960's. It consists of 155 True-False items, which are designed to measure the reactions of young people to a wide range of content over time. The inventory measures eleven constructs, several of which, according to Jesness (1972), are considered important for understanding delinquent behavior. The eleven constructs are; maladjustment, value orientation, immaturity, autism, alienation, manifest aggression, withdrawal, social anxiety, repression, denial, and an asocialization index. The present research used all except the last scale. The decision to omit the asocialization index was based on Butt's (1978) recommendations and procedures of other evaluations using the Jesness Inventory. (Refer to Appendix D for a description of the eleven constructs). The constructs resulted from the application, by Jesness (1972), of several methods of test development: group criterion methods, cluster analysis, and discriminant analysis.

The JI was chosen over other standardized tests such as the Tennessee Self-Concept scale, Cattell's 16PF scale, or the MMPI because it was considered more appropriate for the following reasons: (a) the instrument should be responsive to changes of attitudes, so that it could be used as a valid measure of change over a relatively short time; (b) it could be easily comprehended by persons as young as eight years of age, (c) the measures should be multi-dimensional to allow its use in classifying personality types (Vallance & Forrest, 1971), and (d) the inventory had been successfully used in evaluating adapted Outward Bound programs by a number of others, such as Kelly and Baer (1968) and Hileman (1979).

Directions for the administration of the test are straightforward and scoring is simple. No special training is required to administer the test. Scoring can be done manually and interpreted using T-scores if desired (see Jesness, 1972).

Internal consistency reliability data, based on odd-even scores were collected by Jesness (1972), from a sample of 1862 boys, ages 10 to 18, both delinquent and nondelinquent. The correlations ranged from .62 (value orientation) to .88 (withdrawal) with the average of .72 over the ten scales (Jesness, 1972). Test-retest stability over an eight month period, based on a sample of 131 delinquents, ages 14 to 21, averaged .66 for the ten scales, ranging from .40 (alienation) to .79 (value orientation). Fisher (1967) noted that three of the ten scales (asocialization not included) are valid almost by definition, since they are based on item analysis using criterion groups. The three scales include: "social maladjustment", "immaturity", and "value orientation".

Norms were based on a sample of 970 delinquents and 1075 nondelinquent males, and 450 delinquent and 811 nondelinquent females, ages 8-18. Butt's (1978) review of the JI reported that the age norms were based on 1961 and 1962 data, and since delinquent styles and behaviors have changed over time, their current relevance may be questionable. Hence, the age norms provided in the Jesness Manual were only used as crude comparisons for the present data. (Refer to Table 4 for an outline of mean and standard deviation scores for 15 year-old male delinquent and nondelinquents, based on a combined sample of 258 boys). The decision was also based on observations made by Vallance and Forrest (1971), and Haridson and Curran (1978), who found that in non-American samples, the norms, although somewhat similar, varied from the American norms.

An important factor for consideration on a short term re-test design is faking ability. An example where this might have occurred was in Kelly and Baer's (1968) study. They observed significant differences on six of the ten scales of the JI after a 27-day Outward Bound course for sixty delinquents. Anastasi (1976), however, notes that self-report inventories are

116

especially subject to faking, even when instructions warning respondents to the contrary are provided. Jesness (1972), being aware of this potential with the Jesness Inventory, tested for the possiblity. Based on a sample of 57 delinquents, aged 11-17, Jesness was unable to detect any significant differences between unfaked data and when the students were asked to deliberately fake their responses. Therefore, the Jesness Inventory appears to be a reliable measure over a short period of time.

TABLE 4

Mean and Standard Deviations for 15 Year-old Male Delinquents and Non-delinquents on Ten Scales of the Jesness Inventory

Scale	Delinquent N=135 Mean	Delinquent N=135 Standard deviation	Non-delinquent N=123 Mean	Non-delinquent N=123 Standard deviation
Social Maladjustment (SM)	26.6	6.8	18.7	6.1
Value Orientation (VO)	15.9	7.6	13.7	7.1
Immaturity (Imm)	13.2	4.5	11.6	3.7
Autism (Au)	7.7	4.1	6.3	3.1
Alientation (Al)	8.4	5.3	7.2	4.3
Manifest Aggression (MA)	15.4	6.9	14.2	5.3
Withdrawal (Wd)	12.5	3.7	11.3	2.8
Social Anxiety (SA)	13.3	4.4	13.7	3.5
Repression (Rep)	3.7	2.6	3.2	7.4
Denial (Den)	12.2	3.7	12.7	3.7

Source: The Jesness Inventory Manual, revised 1972, pg.17.

Another area of concern about the Jesness Inventory concerns the general level of the boys reading skills (i.e., Vallance & Forrest, 1971). Even though the Jesness Inventory was designed to be readable by those with a grade six reading capability, a number of boys might still have problems given that some were attending special schools. This was controlled by observing the performance level of the boys, and if they showed signs of difficulty the questions were read aloud to them.

The validation data based on correlations with the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) support concurrent validity, but the empirical validation for the criteria measures and test data were somewhat inadequate. For example, Butt (1978) reports that the means for measuring the behaviors were never described by Jesness. In the 1978 Buros Mental Measurement Year Book, Butt summarizes the review of the JI by asserting that the utility of the inventory as a general personality test, or in predicting delinquency, is limited. The present research project, however, was not concerned with personality types or in predicting delinquency per se, but rather in comparing group responses after different "treatment" experiences, for which the test has been shown to be quite adequate (Fisher, 1967; Kelly & Baer, 1969; Vallance & Forrest, 1971).

According to Bennett (1974) and Smith et al. (1975), self-esteem refers to a measure designed to evaluate an individuals perception of himself. On the other hand, self-report inventories in turn have been identified as measures of self-concept (Anastasi, 1976). Ruch and Zimbardo (1971) suggest that self-concept can be referred to as an individual's awareness of his continuing identity as a person. Both self-esteem and self-concept have a key denominator, that being a measure of awareness of oneself. A number of psychologists in the area of self-concept and self-esteem argue that people characteristically strive to know themselves, and how they perceive themselves often influences their behavior and attitudes (Sarason, 1972). Lemire (1975: 16), in a review of self-concept literature for an evaluation of an adapted Outward Bound program in Alberta, observed that theories of development for personality suggest that low self-concepts "can bring about self-criticism, feelings of depression, guilt feelings, which in turn, may lead to displacement of aggression, insecurity and anxiety." Although admittedly, not all boys with poor self-concepts end up being delinquent, the measure can be used to see whether there is any change in one's self-esteem as a result of an experience such as a wilderness adventure program that is designed to attain such changes.

The Peirs-Harris SEM was selected because it is easily understood by young boys, and it was considered easy to interpret (Porter, 1975). Based on the notion that no response can be clear cut, however, a Likert-type scale was preferred in favour of true-false items, which were used in the original test. The decision for a Likert scale was in part based on Smith et al.'s (1975) test, "Inventory of Outward Bound Effects". Their inventory had four personality sub-scales designed to assess attitudinal and behavioral changes. The scales, as mentioned, which used a Likert format, were effectively able to measure changes of personality attributed to program. A number of the items used in Smith et al.'s inventory were added to the already modified Peirs-Harris SEM to increase the scope of analysis on the self-report form. The form was divided into two equal sections, each with 45 items--A part and B part (see Appendix E for sample forms and definitions of the six sub-scales). The two forms were used to reduce testing time, as well as to counterbalance for any practice effect on the follow-up administration. The two separate forms also helped to reduce any copying opportunities that might have been considered. Depending on the individual's reading ability the form was read aloud to him. In order to account for the modification of Porter's (1975) Peirs-Harris SEM a principal component analysis with a varimax rotation was performed on all the pre-test scores of the control and experimental groups combined. With the varimax solution and an approximation of the Guttman-Kaiser Dichman root one criterion a six factor scale was optimal for the inventory. Selection for items into their respective classification was based on two criterion: 1) items which demonstrated high intercorrelation (.40) and, 2) items which also maintained face validity as determined by seven independent blind ratings of judges, who consisted of criminology graduate students and faculty members. (Refer to Table 16 for the loading weights of each question in forms A and B).

Reliability and validity data are lacking on the revised self-esteem forms. The key reliance is on Porter's (1975) results and on face and criterion validity as determined by the blind raters and the factor analysis results.

Student Rating Form:

The Student Rating Form based on Kelly and Baer's (1968) instructors rating form, and the A.C.T.I.O.N.'78 staff evaluation form was used to offer a close personal observation measure of the experimental groups performance (see Appendix F for a sample form). The form could also be used as a long-range predictive scale according to Kelly and Baer (1968). Kelly and Baer (1968) and Baer et al. (1975) observed that the close personal observation technique served as a significant indicator of predicting nonrecidivism after leaving the program. The staff evaluations also served to identify any potential problem areas for the probationer, which might assist the client's probation officer in handling the youth upon return. Finally, the observations could also be provided to the school board as an indicator of the student's progress. The staff report also served to assist the instructors in relating their observations to the student during private talks or in debriefings.

Self-report Questionnaires:

A self-report questionnaire concerning the A.C.T.I.C.N. program was designed to assess the probationer's opinions of the program just prior to its completion. The report was completed before the graduation ceremonies so as to minimize any possible effects of the graduation outcomes. The questions were based on face validity and independent responses to the form by four judges. The questionnaire was primarily concerned with determining whether the boys found the program to be useful, exciting, and fair (see Appendix J for a sample form).

A background information sheet (see Appendix A) was completed by all the probation officers on their clients to identify their offense records and any problems that the probationer might have. The form also served as a biographical information gathering technique. To complete the biographical data the officers were required to complete a check-list form on each client's progress approximately a month after terminating probation or the program. The questionnaire was adapted from Renner's (1978) survey. The inventory investigated a number of areas including: family and friends, education, delinquency history, probation success/failure, and a number of personal characteristics about their clients.

Three self-report follow-up questionnaires were designed to probe the post "treatment" effects of the program and probation supervision. One form was drafted for the parents or guardian of the boys (see Appendix M for a sample form). This questionnaire was concerned with identifying how the parents or guardian perceived the youth's progress 4 to 6 months after completion of the program. It also served to identify the family relationships and their awareness of any further recidivism by their son. The second inventory was for the participants (see Appendix L for a sample form). The participants' form was intended to observe how the boys were getting along in the community, with their friends and family, and whether they had been involved in any further delinquent acts since the summer. Questions were also asked concerning their feelings about the summer experiences--probation or A.C.T.I.O.N.--and whether they had experienced any changes.

The third self-report follow-up inventory was designed for the probation officers. It asked questions concerning the officers' perceptions of how the youth had been doing in a number of areas such as school, friends, family, delinquent activity and a number of other variables (see Appendix K for a sample form).

Design

Based on the methodological designs presented in Cook and Campbell (1976), recommendations for evaluations of outdoor programs forwarded by Porter (1975) and Dewdney and Miner (1975), and the critique of methodologies presented earlier in the literature review, a true-experimental design was considered to be the most appropriate design in order to measure the objectives of the study. This required the participants to be matched on a number of variables and randomly assigned to either the control or experimental group. In addition, both groups were tested on the same measures before and after the "treatment" as well as sometime after completion of the program, in this case 4 to 6 months depending on when the participants completed their course.

By employing a control group in the design one can improve the ability to draw inferences from the results, provided the experimental and control groups are matched across relevant independent variables and then randomly assigning participants to each group (Kerlinger, 1973). A properly selected control sample from a similar population can also facilitate control variance. According to Kerlinger (1973: 306), control variance includes "maximizing systematic variance, controlling extraneous systematic variance, and minimzing the error variance."

Furthermore, the design permits one to measure change with respect to the control sample, and thus control for effects of time, hold maturation constant, control for the effect of history, mortality, and repeated testing effects (Cook and Campbell, 1976) and thus permits more precise interpretation of the data (Kerlinger, 1973). In addition, the control group scores can be used as a norm for program success/failure which can be defined through follow-up scores equal to, or better than, the mean of the normative samples, as well as compared to the experimental pre-camp scores.

For comparison of the control and experimental groups, a slightly modified interrupted time-series design was used (see, for example, Cook and Campbell, 1976: 274). That is, a time-series design was used in the original design but due to small sample sizes, N = 10 for each of the experimental group sessions, and for purposes of analysis the groups were combined. Therefore, the final design for analysis represents a pretest-posttest control group design with a follow-up. For a graphic illustration of the design and testing procedures refer to Table 5.

While no design is ever fault-proof according to Cook and Campbell (1976), the present design is considered to be theoretically and methodologically more sound than the majority of the studies reviewed earlier. Therefore, the design will hopefully allow one to make more conclusive statements from any significant observations.

Table 5

Research Design for Program A.C.T.I.O.N. 1979

Experimental:	O_1	O_2	O_3	O_4	O_5	O_6	O_7	O_8
Control:	O_1						O_7	O_8

Measurement(s)	Observation(s)
1. Self-esteem measure	O_1, O_7, O_8
2. Jesness Inventory	O_1, O_7, O_8
3. Background Information Probationer	O_1
4. Instructors' Rating Form	O_2, O_3, O_4, O_5
5. A.C.T.I.O.N. self-report questionnaire	O_6
6. Probation Officer's response inventory	O_7
7. Parent/Guardian Life Domain Survey	O_8
8. Participant's follow-up questionnaire	O_8

Note: measurement scales located in Appendicies E,F,J,K,L,M

Testing Procedures

The background to the program has been described earlier. Therefore, this section will basically review the testing procedures and considerations in directing the actual sessions.

On the day of departure for the camp and after completing the equipment check, the participants were gathered in a conference room and were randomly presented the Jesness Inventory and Part A or B of the Self-Esteem Measure. Once they were finished one test they were allowed a few minutes rest before completing the other form. Instructions, as they appeared on each questionnaire, were read aloud before commencing the tests. If any questions were raised they were answered by a monitor who was available to answer questions any time during the tests. Any probationer showing signs of difficulty in reading was taken to a separate room and read the questions aloud by an assistant. Therefore, before departing to D.A.R.E., each participant completed a Jesness Inventory and either form A or B of the Self-Esteem Measure.

When the questionnaires were completed the boys were reassembled and given an informal talk on the consequences of having any alcohol or drugs in their possession. After the talk they were sent outside, alone without any staff, to hide or destroy anything they might not be entitled to bring.

The three courses operated in 21-day intervals from June 12 to August 29, 1979. (Refer to Appendix I for a sample of the 21-day program). The structure of the program varied very little from Group 1 thru Group 3. The key differences were the canoe expeditions. They were varied in location and distance according to the perceived ability of the groups, as some groups learned quicker than others.

Throughout the course of the program the staff, with the exception of the head staff, were responsible for evaluating the participants progress at set time intervals. Two staff were responsible for three boys while the third for four. The responsibility for four students was rotated each session so that each staff was given the responsibility of evaluating three boys sometime during the course of the summer. All the staff cooperated in determining the students progress, but it was the designated instructor who had the final authority to settle their clients' score. To assist the staff in their evaluation procedures they were given access to the probationers' background information sheet, although most preferred not to see them. The students were all made aware of how the staff felt toward their progress at regular intervals throughout the program, and at the end of the sessions were informed as to what was exactly written about them. If any major disagreements were raised by the respective student, their final assessments could be altered. This was considered important because copies of the final report were provided to the youths' probation officer, the court files, as well as the school board if the school decided to grant the student an educational credit in outdoor education.

On the final day prior to the graduation ceremonies the students completed the Jesness Inventory and Part A or B of the SEM, depending on which one they had completed in the pre-camp testing. The experimental group also completed a self-report questionnaire on their assessment of the program, its activities, effects, and utility.

The control groups were presented the Jesness Inventory and the SEM Part A or B by their probation officer during one of their scheduled visits. Each probation officer was presented with a series of written instructions to assure that the control group would be administered the questionnaire in a similar manner as the experimental group. (Refer to Appendix C for a sample outline of directions). After the initial testing an appointment was arranged for 19-21 days later when the posttests would be re-administered in the appropriate manner.

Upon termination, or near completion, of each probationers' probation period a socio-biographical information questionnaire was completed by the clients' respective supervising officer.

All participants were informed at the start of the project that they would be contacted, either by phone or mail, approximately four to six months later for a series of follow-up

131

questionnaires. They were also informed at the time that they would be renumerated for their efforts to come back and complete the forms. Each boy was paid $3.50 for returning and completing the follow-up forms. The monetary incentive was used to increase the return rates.

The parent(s), or guardian of each participant in both the control and experimental group were also made aware of the follow-ups during the summer and asked to assist by completing a mailed questionnaire in the follow-up period (See Appendix M for a sample letter). The mailed questionnaire was accompanied by a covering letter and a stamped self-addressed envelope to facilitate the return rate (Linsky, 1975). In keeping with Linsky's suggestions, a majority of parents were contacted by phone just prior to the mailing to inform them and remind them of the purpose of the forms. Follow-up phone calls were also made to a number of parents who could be contacted if they had not returned the questionnaires within ten days. (Table 5 presents a graphic illustration of the procedures).

All those who participated in the outdoor wilderness program were graduated, as long as they had completed the course and had shown at least a minimal amount of improvement on the staff evaluation form. This procedure was chosen over not graduating "successes" because in Baer et al. (1975) 9 of 10 who were not graduated were reincarcerated within one year of completing the program. The A.C.T.I.O.N. staff, however, did not presume a causal relationship between success or failure, but rather it was felt that positive reinforcement was more functional than negative reinforcement. In order to acknowledge those who did very well and not have their efforts undermined all the students were informed as to the quality of their performance. At the start of the program however, it was emphasized that it was possible to not obtain a graduation certificate, an A.C.T.I.O.N. T-shirt. This ploy was used so that the boys would have something to strive for. Only in extreme cases was it decided that if a boy failed to learn anything from the program would he be failed. This, however, was not encountered.

After all the sessions were completed and data collected, from the experimental and control groups as well as the supporting agencies, the results were analyzed in accordance with the objectives and propositions outlined by the program.

Data Analysis

The statistical breakdown of the data involved two modes of emphasis:

1. to help make decisions to accept or reject relations inferred in the propositions, and
2. to aid in making reliable inferences from any significant empirical observations.

One mode of analysis subjected the standardized objective personality measures (Jesness Inventory and the adapted Peirs-Harris Self-Esteem Measure, Part A and B) to various parametric and non-parametric tests, i.e., t-tests, chi-sqaure, analysis of covaraince and factor analysis, in order to compare pre, post and follow-up data results. The various techniques were also used to tests for any differences within and between the research groups during the different time periods. In general, the analysis were directed to an examination of the success/failure issues as defined by the propositions. The analyses were computed in accordance with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie et al., 1975).

The sub-scales of the personality measures (JI) were first subjected to t-tests and then, if any of the scales were found to be significant, they in turn were analyzed using an analysis of covariance to control for any extraneous variation from the dependent variable(s), thereby increasing measurement precision (Kerlinger, 1973). The Self-Esteem Measure (Part A and B), were first subjected to a factor analysis, as described earlier, to determine whether certain clusters of sub-scales were associated with any differences between the control and experimental groups. After the data had been collected the sub-scales for the pre, post and follow-up results were subjected first to t-tests and then an analysis of covariance.

The second method of analysis dealt with observational data, which included the self-report questionnaires by the clients' probation officer and parent(s). The self-report questionnaires also included the Students' Rating Forms which were used to assess the performance of the delinquents who attended the wilderness program. The data from the self-report forms were meant to possibly:

1. identify certain variables which would account for the success/failure of a/the youth(s),
2. provide additional data that would reflect differences between the control and experimental groups after "treatment", and
3. identify variables that might be considered in future research. The analysis of these data relied primarily on the comparison of mean and percentile differences.

In addition to the statistical analysis, written reports and exemplars of narrative portrayals by the staff and the probationer's parents were supplemented. The narrative reports were directed toward discovery and offering recommendations for change rather than confirmation of statistical results. The information was also used to add face validity and lend insightful descriptive information about the A.C.T.I.O.N. program and/or probation.

While, in general, there is a problem with valididty and reliability of observational and retrospective data this was controlled for by obtaining two or more observations of the relevant variables. These were compared for reliability. Such was the case with the recidivism data, as several different sources were used to determine the recidivism results (see, for example, Waldo and Chiricos, 1977, who discuss the reasoning for such a technique). Validity of the observational reports was based on content validity, representativeness, and construct validity--choosing questions which addressed the theoretical propositions.

J. Results

Our group is like a tree
with many branches,
Some continue to grow
and become stronger,
Some stagnate and are
unchanged,
While some break off and die,
and weaken the tree.

Unknown.

The statistical analyses in the post and follow-up periods on the standardized personality measures and most of the self-report questionnaires, do not lend conclusive support to the primary proposition that the A.C.T.I.O.N. program could serve as a viable alternative to probation. Conversely, however, the descriptive reports of the clients who attended the wilderness program along with narrative comments by their parents and staff, as well as positive changes on two of the Jesness Inventory sub-scales in the post data, do lend support to the proposition that the A.C.T.I.O.N. program did have a short term impact on the probationers in a number of areas identified in the programs objectives. For example, for the experimental group there were improved changes in peer relationships, self-control, self-awareness, social anxiety, respect towards authority, increased self-reliance and better use of leisure time.

The propositions and their results will be reviewed as they appeared in the text above. The Tables for the results section, with the exception of Table 2, have been placed at the end of this section so as to facilitate reading.

Proposition 1: As indicated by the detailed information in Tables 3, 7, and 11 the control and experimental groups' mean scores and standard deviations do not significantly vary on the pre measures. These measures included the 10 sub-scales of the Jesness Inventory, the six sub-scales of the adapted Self-Esteem Measure (Part A and B), and a score of biographical and systemic variables which included: school attendance, age, types of offense records, and duration of probation. (See Table 25 for a complete description of the biographical and systemic results). The observations on the pre-measures supported the contention that the groups were similar across the matched variables. Therefore, since the two groups can be considered relatively homogeneous, the assumptions underlying the use of parametric and non-parametric statistics and degree of generalizability from any findings are supported.

Proposition 2: Following exposure of the experimental group to the A.C.T.I.O.N. program and the control group being dealt with in the routine manner, initial t-test results indicated that for the Self-Esteem Measure there were no significant differences on any of the six sub-scales, either at the follow-up or pretest periods. The analysis did, however, indicate a significant difference ($t = -2.45$, $df = 58$, $p < .01$) on the self-awareness sub-scale and near significance ($t = -1.87$, $df = 58$, $p < .06$) on the self-control sub-scale, at the posttest period. In order to determine if the difference could be accounted for by the independent variable, the A.C.T.I.O.N. program, an analysis of covariance was performed on the data using the pretest data as the covariant. The initial significant observations still held true. The results indicate that while the experimental group became more positive (.13 mean increase) in self-awareness, the controls became less (-.13 mean decrease) expressive of self-awareness. The other sub-scale, self-control, almost indicates a significant difference in the post and follow-up results ($p < .07$ for both the post and follow-up data). Although not statistically significant, the results lend tentative support to the possibility that the control group's self-control improved very slightly (.04 mean increase) while the experimental group was somewhat higher (.17 mean increase). A summary of the data are presented in Tables 11, 12, and 13. (The results of the Jesness Inventory are reviewed in Propositions 5-6).

Propositions 3-4: While there is a significant indication that the experimental group reflected change on one of the sub-scales (self-awareness) and a slight indication on another (self-control) of the Self-Esteem Measure at the posttest but not the follow-up period, the results do not correspond with any significant differences in the reconviction rates (20.0% for both groups at the 4 to 6 month follow-up), "charges laid", or "number found guilty". (Refer to Table 35 for a breakdown of the recidivism data as reported by the probationers). A qualitative examination of the types of offenses and their outcome, however, as presented in Table 37, suggest that the experimental group, although not statistically significant, committed less "severe" offenses, and given the number of offenses committed by either group (N = 5 vs. N = 7) the experimental group had fewer charges completed (N = 5 vs. N = 7). (The decision for a subjective assessment of the degree of severity was based, in part, on the reports by Gendreau and Leipciger (1978) and Moberg and Erickson (1972), who note that to date, an objective index of delinquency is still very crude and of dubious utility). Therefore, in accordance with the SEM scores, exposure to the A.C.T.I.C.N. program may have had a moderately stronger impact on the experimental group's self-awareness and perhaps self-control than the control, and the observed charges may in part account for the subjective difference in types of offenses committed. No conclusive generalizations should be drawn, however, because the results lack statistical significance.

In addition to the differences in severity of offense types, of the five youths in the experimental group charged after completing the wilderness program, four had been questionable for graduation by the staff. That is, if the staff were to have not graduated some of the boys the four would have qualified. The fifth boys' graduation was also refutable. The instructors reported that his improvement, in the areas evaluated, was unreliable as "improvement" only occurred towards the end of the program and appeared to be of questionable sincerity.

The staff observations, combined with the type of offenses committed, lend further qualified support to the main theorem that the A.C.T.I.O.N. program maybe a workable alternative to probation.

Propositions 5-6: T-test results for the ten sub-scales of the Jesness Inventory, obtained at the post and four to six month follow-up periods are summarized in Tables 7, 8, and 9. It may be seen that in the follow-up analysis no statistically significant changes occurred. On the posttest data, however, initial t-test analysis indicated that two of the sub-scales were statistically significant ($t = -2.12$, $df = 58$, $p < .03$ for "alienation" and $t = 3.35$, $df = 58$, $p < .001$ for "social anxiety"), with a third sub-scale, immaturity, being nearly significant ($t = 1.74$, $df = 58$, $p < .08$). Subjecting the scales in the posttest data to an analysis of covariance, in accordance with Cook and Stanley's (1963) favourable argument, the initial differences among the post measure scores show that the covariance results, presented in Table 10, supported the t-test results.

The two scales with significant results were "alienation" and "social anxiety". The significant mean decrease of .70 (F = 8.54, df = 1, $p<.003$) in alienation for the experimental group, compared to a mean increase of 1.8 for the control group, represents a reduced level of distrust, hostility and estrangement towards others, especially towards persons representing authority (Jesness, 1972).

The experimental group's lower scores on the social anxiety scale (F = 6.63, df = 1, $p<.01$, mean decrease of .3) indicates that the boys felt less emotional discomfort towards interpersonal relations than did the control group, at the testing period. The control group had a mean increase of 1.1. The third scale, immaturity, although not significant (F = 1.75, df = 1, $p<.19$) after controlling for initial variances on the pre data, would suggest that the experimental groups lower mean score does represent a tendency to display attitiudes and perceptions of self and others that are more representative of persons older than themselves, as compared to the control group (Jesness, 1972). The difference, however, was primarily due to the fact that the control group's mean score increased (.7), while the experimental group's mean score remained relatively the same (mean increase of .1).

As there were only two sub-scales, of the ten, that denoted significant differences and one with tenuous supportive variance, only limited inferences may be drawn to nondelinquent norms as a function of the wilderness program.

Proposition 7: Based on the findings reported in Propositions 3-4 and 5-6 as well as the results summarized in Table 35, the premise that positive changes in self-esteem and nondelinquent attitudes would be greater for those exposed to the A.C.T.I.O.N. program than the control and that subsequently the experimental group would perform fewer delinquent acts does not hold true. As noted in Propositions 3-4, however, the overall results with the staff evaluations (see Table 32) and significant observational changes on a few sub-scales of the standardized measures at the posttesting did lend some support to the possibility that the experimental group did experience some change and that differences in types of recidivism offenses might be attributable to the wilderness program.

Proposition 8: Tables 15 and 32 summarize the results of the Students' Rating Forms. While it was decided to graduate all the clients who completed the program, no initial comparison of the program's success/failure (as indicated by graduation), could be compared to the recidivism data. The results in Table 32 do indicate, however, that across all the scales there was a significant improvement ($t = 58.8$, $df = 7$, $p < .01$) in effort, initiative, peer relationships, and six other behavioral and attitudinal scales.

Using Kendall coefficients, which are more meaningful when the data contain a large number of tied ranks, as in the cases with the Students' Rating forms, it may be seen that the probationers improved across all the relevant objectives of the 21-day program.

A post hoc chi-square analysis of the parents' responses to eleven questions concerning their sons' behaviors and attitudes since the summer, as summarized in Table 24, tend to support the staff observations. For example, some of the questions concerned their sons' relationships with friends, their self-confidence, use of leisure time and avoidance of new crimes. The analysis did not reveal any statistically significant differences between the two groups. But, in terms of relative frequency scores, a number of the items were seen as having changed more favorably for the experimental than control group. These varaibles included, raltionship with parents (33% vs. 20%, $t = 5.12$, $df = 4$, $p < .27$), self-confidence (57% vs. 20%, $t = 7.98$, $df = 4$, $p < .09$), control of hostility (38% vs. 15%, $t = 3.04$, $df = 4$, $p < .54$), and relationship with friends of the opposite sex (20% vs. 9.5%, $t = 4.12$, $df = 3$, $p < .24$). The other seven scales had probabilities of .59 or greater with a mean of .74.

Based on these results, it may be suggested that the parents and staff perceived the experimental group as having improved in a number of areas, as outlined in the objectives of the program, more so than the control group.

Proposition 3: The detailed descriptive analyses presented in Tables 19A and 19B, 20, and 21 strongly suggest that the experimental groups initial perception of the wilderness program was very positive.

In reference to the probationer's general perception of the A.C.T.I.O.N. program after completing their session, the responses were all favourable (see Table 20). They ranged from 53% saying the staff gave them an easy break to 100% feeling they did not "get a 'bum' rap by going to camp." Other positive responses included 97% feeling they "learnt more good than bad", 57% feeling the program would "help them keep out of trouble", and 83% responding they would "recommend sending their friend if in trouble."

When asked about their feelings towards leaving the camp, the responses were almost unanimously positive, across all seven questions. The responses ranged from 30% saying they felt "bitter" about leaving, to 100% reporting they hoped the program would give them a fresh start. (See Table 21 for a complete breakdown of the results). Only one person (3%) reported that he was "pissed off" about the camp. Further examination of the staff evaluation reports showed that this individual was one of the recidivists who had been classified by the staff as a failure. The youth was sent to training school three months after completing the program.

Since the activities were meant to serve as a "therapeutic" tool by which to present the boys with challenges and adventure, it was interesting to see if the boys perceived any of the activities to be of any help to them. None of the activities were reported as not having helped. The three day solo was seen as being the most helpful (97%), followed by the six day canoe trip and being pushed hard (90% each). The rest of the activities evaluated were reported as having been helpful by 83% of the participants. (Refer to Table 19A for a complete summary).

Finally, in reference to what was "the best way" for probationers "to get along" at the camp, the responses complemented, as indicated in Table 19B, the objectives of the program. One-hundred percent felt that it was "important to get along with others in the crew", 83% felt that "trying to figure yourself out" was good, while only 37% felt that the best way to get along was to "stay out of the way of the staff."

In addition to the positive perception of the program by the experimental group, follow-up data obtained from the experimental and control groups, as presented in Tables 33 and 34, show that even though they had been out of the program for 4 to 6 months the experimental participants still ranked the program as having been "good and helpful." For example, they ranked "getting along with others" still positively (37%--"yes a lot", $N = 29$, $r = -.94$, $p < .001$), as with "helping them as a person" (52%--"yes a lot", $N = 29$, $r = -.97$, $p < .001$) and "help them stay out of trouble" (45%--"yes a lot", $N = 29$, $r = -.95$, $p < .001$). In general, the data lends support to the proposition that the experimental group did perceive the A.C.T.I.O.N. program in a positive manner, in accordance with the self-report follow-up form and self-report form completed just prior to the graduation ceremonies. (General information was gathered from the experimental group but not used because no comparisons were possible. The data are summarized in Tables 17 and 18).

Proposition 10: The proposition stated that the follow-up forms, to be completed by the probationers' parent(s)/guardian(s), and probation officers' would indicate that the experimental participants would reflect more positive changes in terms of reducing recidivism, improving school/work performance, improving peer relationships and general attitude and behavior changes. Due to the large amount of data obtained from the information sheets and the fact that very little of it was significant in reference to the Proposition, this section will only review some of the information obtained that addressed the specific concerns of the Proposition.

The Life Domain Survey, completed by the parent(s)/guardian(s), provided varying results. Subsequently, the analyses of the self-report responses were subdivided into sections, as presented in Tables 22 thru 25. Of first interest was the fact that 66% (N = 20) of the control group parent forms were returned, as compared to 70% (N = 21) forms of the experimental groups parents.

The selected family background characteristics indicated that across the fourteen measures observed, chi-square analysis showed that on only one variable, educational level of the father, was there a significant difference (t = 11.54, df = 12, $p < .04$). The difference was primarily related to the fact that the experimental group had a large number (9 vs. 2) of fathers who did not go beyond public school.

The remaining data suggest that, in general, the participants parents did not go beyond high school (less than 20%), both parents were employed (mother in both group over 50% and fathers over 65%). Families were perceived as being fairly cohesive (over 40%), but perhaps more interestingly proabationers' were seen as being more attached to their mother than father by approx. 20%. While all the results will not be provided here they can be surveyed in Table 25.

In reference to the parents assessment of their son's attitudinal, behavioral and educational performance, the chi-square analysis presented in Table 22 indicated that while there were no significant differences in the areas concerning school attendance or performance, the majority of the boys were at least passing (C's and D's) or better, for both groups (66% vs. 75% in experimental and control groups respectively). The parents of both groups reported no significant differences in attitudes or behavior since probation for neither the experimental nor the control group. The perceptions were,

143

however, generally favourable as approximately 40% of the parents reported "a lot" of improvement across both measures for both groups as compared to approximately 10% reporting "very little change". In specific reference to the A.C.T.I.O.N. participants, the respective parents indicated that there was greater improvement, although not statistically significant, in attitude than behavior (29% vs. 19%). Further support for this observation came from the fact that none of the experimental groups' parents felt that the program was of any use to their son as presented in Table 23.

Table 24 shows that across eleven catagories considered to be "problem" areas for delinquents, there were no significant differences in parental assessments except for one item, self-confidence, which was slightly significant ($t = 7.98$, $df = 4$, $p < .09$). In general, however, the changes in relative frequency indicate that the experimental group's improvement--"some improvement" was greater (31% vs. 25%) than for the control group, but both groups were relatively equal on the category of "no consistent trend or change" (25% vs. 24%).

Finally, although the statistical analysis reveal very little difference between the experimental and control group across the choosen variables, the narrative responses provided in Appendix O suggest that the parents of the experimental participants did perceive the A.C.T.I.O.N. program as being both useful and practical. For example, only 2 (10%) of the control group parents responded to probation as being of any value, while 15 (71%) of the experimental groups' parents responded positively to the wilderness program.

As with the parent/guardian follow-up forms, the Probation Officers' Questionnaire responses provided varying results across the five general areas reviewed. The sections included: 1) personal characteristics and family stability, 2) family criminality, 3) education of probationers, 4) probation process and problems, and 5) delinquency history and related issues. A detailed summary of the data analyses are presented in Tables 25 thru 31.

1) & 2) Personal Characteristics, Family Stability and Family Criminality. Chi-square analyses of the seventeen personal characteristics and family stability measures, and the three measures related to family criminality, indicated that the two groups were basically homogeneous in that no significant observations were made. The results, as presented in Table 25, show that the majority of the parents represent the lower-middle class (over 50%) with incomes between $8,001 to 15,000, had relatively cohesive families (over 45%), the relationship between the son and mother tends to be stronger than for the father (mean difference of 20% in favour of the mother), and according to analysis presented in Table 25, the parents for both groups tended to be employed as laborers or "blue-collar" workers (over 30%). A score of other variables were also

analysed but since none of them were significant or markedly deviant from the norm, they are not presented in the text. Refer to Table 25 for the complete summary of all the variables.

In terms of family criminality, expectedly fathers were reported as having been more frequently involved in criminal or delinquent behavior than the mother (13% vs. approx. 7%). Approximately 25% of both the groups had had a sibling involved in a criminal or delinquent activity. (See Table 26 for a complete summary).

3) Education--Probationers: Most (63% of the experimental and 57% of the control group) of the probationers were still enrolled in school at the time of the 4 to 6 month follow-up period. In terms of related questions, two measures proved to be significant. They included diagnosed learning problems ($t = 9.22$ $df = 3$, $p < .02$), and frequency of school transfer ($t = 8.48$, $df = 3$, $p < .03$). In both cases the experimental group had more boys diagnosed with learning problems and frequency of school transfers. But, as with the parent follow-up forms, the probation officers did not indicate any significant differences in relation to school attendance. School attendance was moderately high (over 55% for both groups) but so were motivational difficulties for both groups (over 55%). (See Table 27 for a complete summary).

4) Probation Process and Problems. The probation officers generally perceived the selected areas for success/failure,

which were based on Renner's (1978) study, during probation to be important in their assessments. The catagories included relationship with friends, parents, drug/alcohol use, self-confidence, and control of hostility (see Table 28). Although they generally perceived the items as being important in determining success/failure during probation, there were no significant variations in the incidence of change during the probation period across the thirteen items. In fact, the majority of the officers noted "no consistent trend or change" across the indicators. The responses for the "no consistent trend or change" was 46.4% for the experimental and 47.6% for the control group. Refer to Table 29 for a complete breakdown of the observed results.

5) Delinquency History and Related Issues. The results presented in Table 30 indicate that most of the probationers were first reported to have had difficulty with the law between the ages 12-15, with a mean age of about 13 for both groups. The most common type of delinquent acts were delinquencies against property and liquor offenses as can be observed by reviewing the results presented in Table 29. The only variable that proved to reflect any significant difference between the two groups was involvement of social agencies during the probation period ($t = 12.25$, $df = 6$, $p < .05$). The noticeable difference was for the experimental group who had more (33% vs. 3%) of their youths either referred to Children's Aid or sent for clinical

assessment than the control group. Also of interest was the observation that the experimental group had slightly more contacts (61% vs. 58%) with the police than the control group (see Table 35). The observation, however, was not significant. And finally, in their overall impression of the youths' performance, since the program or termination of probation, as presented in Table 30, the officers in order of preference reported "neither success or failure" (37% vs. 43% in favour of the controls), "qualified success" (30% vs. 40% in favour of the controls) and finally for "unqualified success" it was 13% vs. 7% in favour of the experimental group. The chi-square analysis indicated, however, there were no significant differences between the two groups.

Summary. Based on the follow-up data provided by the probation officers and the parent(s)/ guardian(s) of the probationers, the quantitative data suggested few, if any, statistical differences between the two groups across the selected variables of recidivism, school/work performance, family relations and general attitudinal and behavioral changes. Only the narrative reports in the follow-up forms of the experimental groups parents and the results from the Staff Rating Forms suggest that the program was of merit.

In light of the inconclusive results the question of whether the A.C.T.I.O.N. program could serve as a viable alternative for youths on probation will be left for elaboration in the final section.

TABLE 6

Program A.C.T.I.O.N. Expenditure

1978 - 1979

Items	1978 Actual	1979 Appropriations	1979 Actual
camp groceries	$2,073.91	$2,600.00	$2,261.50
meals in transit	201.39	250.00	189.87
sub-total	2,275.30	2,850.00	2,451.37
less groceries returned	104.58	- -	206.54
TOTAL food	$2,170.72	$2,850.00	$2,244.83
Transportation	337.92	400.00	371.00
Insurance	50.00	60.00	- -
Awards	226.30	250.00	221.00
Miscellaneous	81.76	200.00	193.25
Research	- -	3,600.00	1,800.00
Rental of van	- -	- -	2,289.72
TOTAL COST	$2,866.70	$7,360.00	$7,120.80

1978 Per Diem rate for Program A.C.T.I.O.N. $6.52

1979 Per Diem rate for Program A.C.T.I.O.N. $11.30

Note: $1,800 was all that could be contracted for the project from the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

Note: In 1979 the program had to rent a van for transporting the participants whereas the year before the Ministry loaned a van to the program for the summer. In 1979 there were none available for loan.

TABLE 7

T-test Results for Pre-test on Experimental and Control Groups on the Jesness Inventory

# Scale (items)	Experimental (N=30) mean	S.D.	Control (N=30) mean	S.D.	t value (df=58)	2 Tailed variance estimate signif. level
Sm(63)	24.9	6.4	24.3	7.1	-.28	.77
VO(39)	16.6	6.7	17.9	6.9	.70	.48
Imm(45)	13.9	4.3	15.2	4.8	1.12	.26
Au(28)	9.1	4.1	9.7	4.3	.52	.60
Al(26)	10.1	4.6	11.5	4.1	1.28	.21
MA(31)	15.0	5.5	15.8	5.7	.55	.58
Wd(24)	16.9	3.7	12.1	3.6	.18	.86
SA(24)	12.1	3.3	11.9	3.7	-.29	.77
Rep(15)	3.7	1.9	4.2	2.8	.70	.49
Den(20	11.3	3.6	10.1	3.4	-1.31	.19
TOTAL 155						

NOTE: see Appendix D for a description of the Jesness Scales

TABLE 8

T-test Results for Post-test on Experimental and Control Groups on the Jesness Inventory

# Scale (items)	Experimental (N=30) mean	Experimental (N=30) S.D.	Control (N=30) mean	Control (N=30) S.D.	t value (df=58)	2 tailed pooled variance estimate signif.**
Sm(63)	24.7	7.8	23.7	6.8	-.55	.58
VO(39)	14.9	7.0	16.5	5.5	1.00	.32
Imm(45)	12.6	3.2	14.4	4.7	1.74	.08
Au(28)	9.0	3.7	9.3	4.9	.24	.81
Al(26)	7.6	4.5	11.1	3.6	3.35	.001**
MA(31)	15.1	5.8	14.6	4.8	-.31	.75
Wd(24)	11.3	3.0	11.9	3.0	.72	.47
SA(24)	11.3	4.0	11.4	3.2	-2.18	.03**
Rep(15)	3.6	1.7	4.0	2.5	.77	.44
Den(20)	12.6	3.7	11.2	3.2	-1.58	.12

** significant, P<.05

Note: see Appendix D for a description of the Jesness Scales

TABLE 9

T-test Results for Follow-up on Experimental and Control Groups in the Jesness Inventory

Scale (# items)	Experimental (N=30) mean	Experimental (N=30) S.D.	Control (N=30) mean	Control (N=30) S.D.	t value (df=58)	2 tailed pooled variance estimate signif.**
Sm(63)	24.0	6.9	21.3	6.9	-1.41	.16
VO(39)	15.4	7.6	14.4	6.6	-.49	.62
Imm(45)	12.5	3.8	13.7	4.3	1.11	.27
Au(28)	9.2	4.0	7.3	3.2	-1.89	.06
Al(26)	8.3	4.3	9.3	4.4	.80	.42
MA(31)	14.5	6.3	13.0	4.4	-1.00	.32
Wd(24)	11.7	3.1	11.5	3.8	-.19	.85
SA(24)	11.6	4.0	10.3	3.2	-1.33	.18
Rep(15)	3.3	2.0	4.2	2.6	1.42	.16
Den(20)	11.7	3.6	12.4	3.7	.66	.51

** significant, P<.05

Note: see Appendix D for a description of the Jesness Scales

TABLE 10

Analysis of Covariance on Jesness Inventory for Pre-post Data:Main Effect Explained

Scale	mean square	F Value (df=1)	Signif. level of F
Social-Maladjustment	6.96	.22	.63
Value orientation	9.52	.49	.48
Immaturity	21.03	1.75	.19
Autism	0.42	.04	.82
Alientation	114.74	9.55	.003
Manifest Aggression	17.47	2.15	.14
Withdrawal	3.45	.60	.44
Social Anxiety	53.42	6.63	.01
Represssion	0.82	.22	.63
Denial	6.47	.87	.35

TABLE 11

T-test Results for Pretest Data of Experimental and Control Groups on the Self-Esteem Scales: A & B Form Combined

# Scale (items)	Experimental (N=30) mean	Experimental (N=30) S.D.	Control (N=30) mean	Control (N=30) S.D.	t value (df=58)	2 tailed pooled variance signif. level
Self conception	2.9	.66	3.0	.63	-.37	.71
Anxiety	3.2	.65	3.4	.67	-.83	.41
Social	2.8	.35	3.0	.33	-2.03	.04
Self-awareness	2.7	.53	2.8	.67	-.39	.69
Self-control	3.0	.38	3.0	.44	.19	.84
Self-awareness II	2.9	.48	3.1	.58	-1.35	.18

TABLE 12

T-test Results for Post-test Data of Experimental and Control Groups on the Self-Esteem Scales: A & B Form Combined

Scale # (items)	Experimental (N=30)		Control (N=30)		t value (df=58)	2 tailed pooled variance signif. level
	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.		
Self-conception	3.2	.49	3.3	.31	-.53	.59
Anxiety	3.4	.57	3.4	.31	.24	.81
Social	2.8	.30	2.9	.26	-1.02	.31
Self-awareness	2.7	.52	2.9	.31	-2.45	.01
Self-control	2.9	.46	3.1	.36	-1.87	.06
Self-awareness II	2.9	.40	2.9	.28	.47	.63

TABLE 13

T-test Results for Follow-up Data of Experimental and Control Groups on the Self-Esteem Scales: A & B Form Combined

# Scale (items)	Experimental (N=30) mean	Experimental (N=30) S.D.	Control (N=30) mean	Control (N=30) S.D.	t value (df=58)	2 tailed pooled variance signif. level.
Self-conception	3.2	.58	3.0	.68	1.33	.18
Anxiety	3.4	.37	3.3	.50	.28	.78
Social	2.9	.36	3.0	.38	-1.24	.21
Self-awareness	2.8	.41	2.9	.47	-.91	.36
Self-control	3.2	.40	3.0	.26	1.56	.12
Self-awareness II	2.9	.54	3.1	.50	-1.30	.19

TABLE 17

Analysis of Covariance Results on Self-Esteem Scales for Pre(1),Post(2),Follow-up(3) Data

	Time Periods								
	1 - 2			2 - 3			1 - 3		
Scale	Mean Sq.	F value	Signif. of F (df=1)	Mean Sq.	F value	Signif. of F (df=1)	Mean Sq.	F value	Signif. of F (df=1)
Self-concept	.05	.23	.63	.79	2.15	.14	1.00	3.54	.06
Anxiety	.04	.26	.65	.01	.09	.75	.08	.66	.42
Social	.08	1.00	.31	.23	1.80	.18	.11	.89	.34
Self-awareness	1.08	5.78	.01	.19	1.07	.30	.15	.88	.35
Self-control	.33	3.40	.07	.10	.51	.47	.33	3.40	.07
Self-awareness II	.15	.79	.37	.00	.00	.98	.15	.79	.37

TABLE 15

Mean Scores and Range of Ratings for Instructors' Rating Forms on Experimental Group (N=30)

Scale (1-5)	Day 5 $\bar{X}$/Range	Day 10 $\bar{X}$/Range	Day 15 $\bar{X}$/Range	Final Report Day 20 $\bar{X}$/Range
Effort	3.9 .5-4.0	3.7 1.5-5	4.0 2.5-4.5	4.1 2.5-5
Maturity	3.7 1-4.5	3.6 1.5-5	3.8 2-5	4.0 2-5
Leadership	2,3.6 1-4.5	3.6 2-4.5	3.8 2-5	3.7 2-5
Competence	3.5 1-4.5	3.6 2-4.5	3.6 2-4.6	3.8 2-4
Physical Ability	3.9 3-5	4.0 3-5	4.2 2.5-5	4.2 2.5-5
Staff relationship	3.7 1.5-4.5	4.1 2-5	4.0 2.5-5	4.0 2-5
Initiative	3.2 .5-4	3.3 1-4.5	3.4 1-4.5	3.5 1-4.5
Environmental Awareness	3.0 1-5	3.1 1.5-4.5	3.4 1.5-5	3.5 1.5-5
Determination	3.5 1-5	3.7 1.5-4.5	4.0 1.5-5	4.0 2-5
Peer Relationship	3.5 2-5	3.8 2-5	3.9 2-5	4.0 2-5

Note: See Appendix F for Instructors' Rating Form and definitions of Scales

TABLE 16

Factor Analysis Scores for Self-Esteem Items: Part A & B

Scale and Items (form A or B) 1-5 scale	Item Loading
1. self-control (A)	
22. I do bad things.	.72
32. I pick on my brother(s) and sister(s).	.68
39. I like being the way I am.	-.63
40. I feel left out of things.	.40
self-control (B)	
3. I wish I were different.	.55
8. I am often mean to other people.	.52
12. I am cheerful all the time.	-.71
13. I am dumb about a lot of things.	.47
19. My family is disappointed in me.	.74
21. Whenever I try to do something, everything seems to go wrong.	.59
22. I am picked on at home.	.54
26. I forget what I learn.	.56
30. I am a good reader.	-.42
34. I am often afraid.	.70
36. I can be trusted.	.53
43. I feel confident that I can handle the problems that arise in the future.	-.56
2. anxiety (A)	
3. It is hard for me to make friends.	.49
4. I am often sad.	.42
6. I am shy.	.66
7. I get nervous when the teacher calls on me.	.49
8. My looks bother me.	.52
10. I get worried when we have tests in school.	.63
18. I usually want things my own way.	.48
20. I give up easily.	.58
28. I am nervous.	.74
31. In school, I am a dreamer.	.47
37. I worry a lot.	.60
38. I feel left out of things.	.55
40. I need somebody else to push me through on most things.	.66
44. My parents expect to much of me.	.61
anxiety (B)	
2. I often volunteer at school.	.46
7. I am sick a lot.	.37
8. I am often mean to other people.	.42
10. I am a happy guy.	.53
24. I am clumsy.	.55

TABLE 16 (continued)

Scale and Items (form A or B) 1-5 scale	Item Loading
29. I am popular with girls	.53
33. I think I have a good body	-.71
35. I am always breaking or dropping things	.72
3. social acceptance (A)	
2. I am a happy person	-.66
4. I am often sad	.54
9. When I grow up, I will be an important person	-.45
12. I am well behaved in school	-.68
13. It is usually my fault when something goes wrong	.60
14. I cause trouble in my family	-.69
17. I am an important member of the family	-.52
25. I behave badly at home	.58
34. I often get into trouble	.55
35. I am obedient at home	-.60
36. I am lucky	.48
37. I worry a lot	.42
social acceptance (B)	
6. I am among the last to be chosen for games	-.45
9. My classmates in school think I have good ideas	.69
10. I am a happy guy	.52
11. I have many friends	.71
14. I am good looking	.73
15. I have a lot of energy.	-.43
17. I am popular with other boys my age	.71
18. People pick on me.	-.77
23. I am a leader in games and sports	.48
28. I lose my temper easily	-.74
29. I am popular with girls	.60
37. I am different from other people	-.55
4. self-awareness (A)	
15. I am strong	.49
16. I have good ideas	.45
23. I can draw well.	.41
27. I am an important member of the class	.67
29. I have pretty eyes	.63
33. My friends like my ideas	.86
self-awareness (B)	
1. I have nice hair	.67
20. I have a pleasant face.	.75
25. In games and sports, I would rather watch than play	.71
26. I forget what I learn	.52
31. I would rather work alone than be with a group	.52

TABLE 16 (continued)

Scale and Items (form A or B) 1-5 scale	Item Loading
32. I like my brother(s)(sister(s))	.47
40. I am a good person	.68
41. Most of my feelings and motives are a mystery to me	.60
45. I let other people decide what to do	.48
5. Self-concept (A)	
1. My class mates make fun of me	-.45
5. I am smart	-.55
19. I am good at making things with my hands	.52
20. I give up easily	.46
21. I am good in my school work	.77
26. I am slow in finishing my school work	-.78
42. When I run into a new challenge, I know myself well enough to know if I can do it	.60
43. I feel a person is better off when he takes responsibility for himself.	.63
self-concept (B)	
7. I am sick a lot	.44
13. I am dumb about a lot of things	.48
16. I get into a lot of fights	.57
38. I think bad thoughts a lot	.82
44. I believe that what happens to me is my own fault	-.69
45. I let other people decide what to do	.58
6. Self-awareness concept II (A)	
1. My classmates make fun of me	.41
11. I am unpopular.	.62
19. I am good at making things with my hands	.51
23. I can draw well	.65
31. In school, I am a dreamer	-.44
41. I have spent a lot of time thinking about who I am and what I can do.	
self-awareness concept II (B)	
4. I sleep well at night	-.52
5. I hate school	.58
6. I am among the last to be chosen for games	.56
7. I am sick a lot	.43
22. I am picked on at home	-.46
27. I am easy to get along with	.60
40. I am a good person	.40
42. If I had to, I could list most of my weaknesses and strengths	.55
30. I am a good reader	.51

Note: factor six, self-awareness concept II label was decided by rating of seven independent judges

TABLE 17

Selected Family Background Information for Experimental Group (N=30)

Questions	Experimental Group Response % Yes
Still in school?	90
Would like to go to university	60
The offence they committed deserved 'punishment'?	73
Best friend been in trouble with law?	70
Father expected client to get into trouble?	90
Mother expected client to get into trouble ?	68
Any family members work?	60

TABLE 18

Relationship with Father and Mother

Experimental Group (N=30)

	Response Levels			
	OK(%)	Very well(%)	Poorly(%)	Not know(%)
Father	43	43	10	10
Mother	17	73	10	0

Table 19A

Assessment of A.C.T.I.O.N. Activities by Experimental Group (N=30)

Any of the following Experiences help?	Frequency of Response % yes
Being alone.	83
Being told what to do.	8
Help the staff.	83
Climbing and rapelling.	83
Canoe trip.	90
Being pushed hard.	90
Nothing helped.	3
Solo helpful.	97

Table 19B

Experimental Groups Opinion of How to 'Get along' at Camp (N=30)

Questions	Frequency of Response % yes
Playing it 'cool' (not get into fights, no backtalking, etc.).	86
Staying out of the way of the staff.	37
Trying to figure self out.	90
Trying to do your best.	97
Good to keep mouth shut.	17
Important to befriend the staff.	90
Important to get along with others in the crew	100

TABLE 10

Experimental Groups Perceptions of the Program (N=30)

Questions	Frequency of Response % Yes
Got a 'bum' rap by going to camp?	0
Program will help to keep out of trouble?	57
Like themselves better than before program?	97
Would like to come back for a visit?	84
Learned more good than bad?	97
They did their share of work?	90
Staff gave them easy breaks?	53
Not unnecessarily picked-on?	10
If they could be one of the staff would run the program in same manner?	90
Program made them stronger and healthier?	73
If pass the program they would be better able to keep out of future trouble?	86
Could now, in general, get along better?	90
Staff were helpful?	90
Broke program rules?	20
Given a fair chance to 'make good' before going to camp?	73
Felt the staff were fair?	86
Would not keep their participation in A.C.T.I.O.N. a secret?	83
Would wear their A.C.T.I.O.N. T-shirt?	100
Would recommend sending their friend if in trouble?	83
The program was a good way for paying for their wrong doing?	70
Are you still tough?	60

TABLE 21

Experimental Groups Feelings about Leaving the Course (N=30)

Questions	Frequency of Response % Yes
Bitter?	30
Feeling 'different'?	73
Feeling friendlier?	97
More helpful?	100
Relaxed?	83
Hope program will give them a fresh start?	100
"Pissed off" about the camp?	97

TABLE 21

Parents' Assessment of Selected Attitudes, Behavior and Educational Performance

Category	Code	Experimental Group Relative Frequency	Control Group Relative Frequency
Son attending school[a]			
	Yes	86	75
	No	15	75
$^{a}\chi^2 = 8.22$, df = 1, $p < .63$.			
Grade Attending - January 1980[b]			
	8	14	10
	9	43	50
	10	24	20
	11	0	5
	Not attending	19	15
[b]mean grade = 9.1 (exp.group) and 9.2 (control group)			
School attendance problem[c]			
	Yes	33	25
	no	52	65
	Not applicable	14	10
$^{c}\chi^2 = 3.28$, df = 2, $p < .19$.			
Academic Performance[d]			
	very well (A's)	5	5
	good (A's,B's & C's)	41	45
	fair (C's & D's)	29	25
	poorly (failure)	18	10
	no answer	5	15

$^{d}\chi^2 = 1.45$, df = 4, $p < .83$.

TABLE 21 (continued)

Category	Code	Experimental Group Relative Frequency	Control Group Relative Frequency
Son's employment status if not in school[e]			
	Full-time	0	17
	Part-time	17	0
	Not working	83	83
$^{c}\chi^2$ = 2.00, df = 2, p<.36.			
Son's attitude since probation termination[f]			
	Improved a lot	43	40
	Improved	5	10
	Some change	33	25
	Very little change	10	5
	Attitude not changed	10	10
	No problem before	0	10
$^{f}\chi^2$ = 3.03, df = 5, p<.69.			
Son's behavior since probation termination[g]			
	Improved a lot	38	40
	Improved	10	10
	Some change	38	30
	Very little change	10	0
	Behavior not changed	8	15
	No problem before	0	5
$^{g}\chi^2$ = 4.26, df = 5, p<.51.			

TABLE 23

Parents' Assessment of Attitudinal and Behavioral Changes for A.C.T.I.O.N. Participants

Assessment	Attitude Relative Frequency	Behavior Relative Frequency
Improved a lot	29	19
Improved	43	64
Some change	29	14
Very little change	0	0
Attitude not changed	0	0
No problem before	0	0

TABLE 24

Parents' Assessment of "Problem" Areas after Probation Termination

	Rating Scale exp./control group						
"Problem" Areas	Some Improvement	No consistent trend or change	Some deterioration	not a problem	don't know	chi-square	sign. level
Relationship with friends	19/30	38/35	5/10	24/15	15/10	1.47	<.83
Relationship with parents	33/20	27/15	10/10	29/40	0/15	5.08	<.27
Relationship with co-workers	14/20	33/25	0/5	33/25	19/25	1.89	<.75
Relationship with friends of opposite sex	10/20	43/25	0/0	19/40	29/15	4.12	<.24
Relationship with authority figures	38/30	14/20	5/5	29/25	14/20	.63	<.95
Use of leisure time	29/40	29/30	5/0	29/15	10/15	2.46	<.65
Progress in school/work	33/45	23/25	10/0	19/20	14/10	2.42	<.65
Drug/alcohol use	5/0	14/10	5/0	57/50	19/25	2.77	<.59
Self-confidence	57/20	19/30	5/0	14/40	5/10	7.98	<.09
Control of hostility	38/15	29/35	5/10	24/30	5/10	3.08	<.54
Avoidance of new crimes	29/35	10/10	5/5	43/20	14/25	1.69	<.79
Mean percentages	31.3/25.0	25.3/23.6	5.0/4.0	29.0/29.0	13.0/16.3		

Note: Numbers in the rating scale columns represent relative frequency.

TABLE 25

Personal Characteristics, Family Stability and Demographic Variables

Category	Code	Experimental Group Relative Frequency	Control Group Relative Frequency
Neighbourhood Status[a]			
	Upper Class	0	3
	Upper Middle Class	23	7
	Lower Middle Class	47	57
	Lower Class	27	27
	Lower Lower Class	3	7
a $\chi^2 = 4.40$, df = 4, $p < .35$.			
Yearly Household Income of Family[b]			
	\$8,000 or less	7	17
	\$8,001 to \$15,000	47	50
	\$15,001 to \$25,000	37	30
	\$25,001 or over	7	5
	cannot guess	3	0
b $\chi^2 = 1.93$, df = 4, $p < .58$.			
Reliance on Social Assistance Income for Family[c]			
	Frequent use	20	17
	Infrequent use	33	37
	Do not know	47	47
c $\chi^2 = 0.21$, df = 2, $p < .93$.			
Living Companion(s) at time of Probation Order[d]			
	With both parents	57	63
	With mother only	10	20
	With father only	3	7
	Mother and other male	10	10
	Father and other male	3	0
	Foster home	0	0
	Institute or Group home	13	0
	Relative or friend	0	0
	Common Law, married	0	0
	No response	0	0
d $\chi^2 = 5.58$, df = 6. $p < .28$.			

TABLE 25 (continued)

Category	Code	Experimental Group Relative Frequency	Control Group Relative Frequency
Cohesiveness of Probationers' Family[e]			
	Very Cohesive	73	13
	Somewhat cohesive	47	53
	Not cohesive	30	33
e $\chi^2 = 1.00$, df = 2, $p<.60$.			
Relationship with Parents[f]			
	Attached	33	43
	Indifferent	37	27
	Inconsistent	27	30
	Hostile	3	0
f $\chi^2 = 1.92$, df = 3, $p<.58$.			
Probationers' Relationship with Father[g]			
	Attached	37	27
	Indifferent	40	37
	Inconsistent	20	13
	Hostile	3	17
	Don't know	0	7
g $\chi^2 = 5.58$, df = 4, $p<.23$.			
Probationers' Relationship with Mother[h]			
	Attached	53	53
	Indifferent	27	27
	Inconsistent	17	17
	Hostile	3	3
h $\chi^2 = 2.00$, df = 3, $p<.63$.			

TABLE 25(continued)

Category	Code	Experimental Group Relative Frequency	Control Group Relative Frequency
Probationer Removed from Home During Probation Order[i]			
	Group home	17	13
	Foster home	0	0
	Relative's home	0	3
	Treatment centre	7	0
	Institution	0	0
	Not applicable	67	83
	More than one removal	10	0
i $\chi^2 = 6.66$, df = 6, $p < .15$.			
Probationer Adopted[j]			
	Yes	10	0
	No	90	100
j $\chi^2 = 1.40$, df = 1, $p < .23$.			
Either Parent Died[k]			
	Yes	0	3
	No	100	97
k $\chi^2 = 0.00$, df = 1, $p < 1.00$.			
Remarriage or now Common-law Union of Parents[l]			
	Yes	20	13
	No	80	80
	Don't know	0	7
l $\chi^2 = 2.40$, df = 2, $p < .30$.			
Parental Divorce/Separation[m]			
	Yes	27	40
	No	73	60
m $\chi^2 = 0.67$, df = 1, $p < .41$.			

TABLE 25(continued)

Category	Code	Experimental Group Relative Frequency	Control Group Relative Frequency
Intermittent Separation of Parents[n]			
	Yes	30	37
	No	70	60
	Don't know	0	3

[n] $\chi^2 = 1.48$, df = 2, $p < .48$.

Category	Code	Experimental Group Relative Frequency	Control Group Relative Frequency
Prolonged Absence of a Parent from Home[o]			
	Yes	10	27
	No	80	70
	Don't know	10	3

[o] $\chi^2 = 3.47$, df = 2. $p < .17$.

TABLE 25 (continued)

Category	Code	Experimental/Control Group Father Relative Frequency	 Mother Relative Frequency
Employment Status of Father[p] and Mother[q] during Probation Period			
	Employed	60/60	37/50
	In and out of work	7/10	13/7
	Unemployed, but looking	0/0	7/3
	Unemployed, and not looking	0/3	10/20
	Not applicable/ don't know	13/27	33/20
p $\chi^2 = 3.39$, df = 4, $p < .33$.			
q $\chi^2 = 3.61$, df = 4, $p < .46$.			
Usual Occupation of Father[r] and Mother[s]			
	Professional	10/3	0/3
	Manager, official and/ or Proprietor	12/10	0/3
	Technical/Administrative	3/10	3/0
	Clerical/Filing	10/3	3/3
	Sales	3/7	3/3
	Craftsman, foreman	10/7	0/3
	operatives	10/3	0/0
	Services	0/0	10/0
	Labourers	27/27	27/33
	Private household	0/3	13/3
	Homemaker	0/0	7/7
	Not applicable/ don't know	27/13	33/33
r $\chi^2 = 10.43$. df = 11, $p < .53$.			
s $\chi^2 = 12.72$, df = 11, $p < .29$.			

TABLE 26

Family Criminality

Category	Code	Experimental Group Relative Frequency	Control Group Relative Frequency
Father Criminal or Delinquent Record[a]			
	Yes	13	13
	No	70	63
	Don't know	17	23
Mother Criminal or Delinquent Record[b]			
	Yes	7	0
	No	77	83
	Don't know	17	17
Sibling(s) Criminal or Delinquent Record[c]			
	Yes	27	23
	No	47	57
	Don't know	27	20

a $\chi^2 = 0.43$, df = 2, $p < .80$.

b $\chi^2 = 2.08$, df = 2, $p < .35$.

c $\chi^2 = 1.43$, df = 2, $p < .69$.

TABLE 27

Educational Status of Probationer

Category	Code	Experimental Group Relative Frequency	Control Group Relative Frequency
Attendance Problem[a]			
	Yes	63	57
	No	37	43
Motivational Difficulties in School[b]			
	Yes	73	60
	No	23	40
	Don't know	3	0
Discipline Problem in School[c]			
	Yes	33	20
	No	63	80
	Don't know	3	0
Diagnosed Learning Problem[d]			
	Yes	10	0
	No	67	97
	Don't know	23	3
Frequency of School Transfer[e]			
	Frequently	27	13
	Occasionally	40	47
	Rarely	33	20
	Never	0	20

[a] $\chi^2 = 0.06$, df = 1, $p<.79$.

[b] $\chi^2 = 2.71$, df = 2, $p<.25$.

[c] $\chi^2 = 2.58$, df = 2, $p<.27$.

[d] $\chi^2 = 9.92$, df = 2, $p<.02$**.

[e] $\chi^2 = 8.48$, df = 3, $p<.03$** .

TABLE 28

Areas Considered to be Important for Success/Failure During Probation

Problem Areas	Rating Scale:Exp/Control Group very important	important	not important	not applicable irrelevant	χ^2	sign. level
Relationship with friends	67/73	20/27	13/0	0/0	4.38	<.11
Relationship with parents	80/83	17/17	3/0	0/0	1.02	<.60
Relationship with friends of opposite sex	33/47	13/27	43/37	3/0	2.91	<.40
Relationship with co-workers	40/37	23/10	30/23	13/0	2.54	<.46
Relationship with authority figures	33/47	27/27	7/3	0/0	.35	<.83
Use of leisure time	67/70	30/23	7/3	0/0	.80	<.66
Acceptable living quarters	63/73	27/27	40/27	3.7	1.56	<.66
Progress in employment	37/37	10/3	33/43	20/17	1.48	<.68
Progress in school	73/87	23/3	3/10	0/0	5.83	<.05
Drug/alcohol use	59/67	17/27	17/7	10/0	5.22	<.15
Self-confidence	77/90	20/10	0/3	0/0	2.32	<.31
Control of hostility	47/43	17/20	30/30	7.7	.12	<.98
Avoiding new crimes	93/83	20/7	7/7	0/3	3.19	<.06
A.C.T.I.O.N.	67/43	30/30	3/13	0/3	7.28	<.06
Mean percentages	58.1/62.8	21.0/18.4	16.8/14.7	4.0/4.0		

Note: numbers in the rating scale columns represent relative frequency.

TABLE 29

Incidence of Problems and Change During Probation Period

	Rating Scale: Exp/Control Group						
Problem Areas	some improvement	no consistent trend or change	some deterioration	not a problem	don't know	χ^2	sign. level
Relationship with friends	60/43	27/47	0/7	13/3	0/0	6.24	<.10
Relationship with parents	30/37	53/40	3/17	10/7	3/0	4.63	<.32
Relationship with friends of opposite sex	10/10	57/53	0/0	17/30	17/7	2.45	<.48
Relationship with co-workers	7/7	53/53	7/10	30/30	3/0	1.20	<.87
Relationship with authority figures	40/23	40/53	7/13	13/10	0/0	2.69	<.44
Use of leisure time	30/47	53/43	10.7	7.3	0/0	1.93	<.58
Acceptable living quarters	10/10	57/57	7/0	27/33	0/0	2.22	<.52
Progress in employment	7/7	50/40	7/3	37/50	3/0	1.28	<.73
Progress in school	30/40	43/43	17/17	7/0	10/0	3.42	<.48
Drug/alcohol use	43/30	40/60	17/13	20/17	0/0	4.54	<.33
Self-confidence	20/7	47/53	3/17	7/0	0/0	5.52	<.13
Avoiding new crimes	33/33	48/37	17/26	7/10	0/0	.45	<.92
Control of Hostility	20/7	40/40	7/13	30/7	0/0	4.09	<.39
Mean percentages	25.6/23.3	46.4/47/6	8.2/10.5	17.1/17.9	2.7/7		

Note: Numbers in rating scale columns represent the relative frequency.

TABLE 30

Delinquency History and Related Issues

Category	Code	Experimental Group Relative Frequency	Control Group Relative Frequency
Age of First Recorded Evidence of Difficulty with the Law[a,b]			
	Under 11	13	0
	12 - 13	33	53
	14 - 15	53	47
Period of time for which Probation Order Made[c]			
	6 months or less	40	43
	7 to 12 mths	40	47
	12 to 18 mths	17	3
	19 to 24 mths	0	3
	over 24 mths	0	0
	Indefinite	3	3
Actual time spent on Probation[d]			
	6 months or less	17	17
	7 to 12 mths	53	63
	12 to 18 mths	20	10
	19 to 24 mths	7	10
	over 24 mths	3	0

a $\chi^2 = 5.51$, df = 2, $p < .06$.

b mean age of first recorded evidence = 13.4 for both groups

c $\chi^2 = 3.86$. df = 5. $p < .42$.

d $\chi^2 = 4.25$, df = 4, $p < .51$.

Note: It appears that most probationers had their probation extended as the mean shift from "time for probation" to "actual time" went from between 6 - 9 months to approx. 12 months.

TABLE 30 (continued)

Category	Code	Experimental Group Relative Frequency	Control Group Relative Frequency
Amount of Supervision Required[e]			
	Intensive supervision	40	23
	Medium supervision	47	63
	Minimal supervision	13	13
	No supervision required	0	0

e $\chi^2 = 2.07$, df = 2, $p < 35$.

Category	Code	Experimental Group Relative Frequency	Control Group Relative Frequency
Social Agencies Involved with Probationers During Probation[f]			
	Children's Aid Society	20	0
	Clinical (i.e. psychological assessment)	13	3
	Hospital (i.e. physical illness)	0	3
	Residential treatment centre (i.e. emotional disturbance problem)	3	0
	Family Service Assoc.	17	17
	More than one agency	7	7
	Not applicable	40	70

f $\chi^2 = 12.25$, df = 6, $p < .05$.

Category	Code	Experimental Group Relative Frequency	Control Group Relative Frequency
Removal from the Home During Probation Order[g]			
	Group Home	10	13
	Foster Home	0	0
	Relatives Home	0	3
	Treatment Centre	0	0
	Institution	7	0
	More than one	10	0
	Not applicable	73	83

g $\chi^2 = 8.06$, df = 5, $p < .5$.

TABLE 30 (continued)

Category	Code	Experimental Group Relative Frequency	Control Group Relative Frequency
Number of Charges Laid During Probation Order[h]			
	No charge	63	73
	One charge	27	7
	2 - 3 charges	10	20
	4 or more	0	0
	Don't know	0	0
Probation Officers' Evaluation of Probationer's Success[i]			
	Unqualified success	13	7
	Qualified success	30	40
	Neither success or failure	37	43
	Successful start, followed by deterioration	3	3
	Clear and definite failure	10	7
	No answer	7	0

[h] $\chi^2 = 4.81$, df = 2, $p < .08$.

[i] $\chi^2 = 3.46$, df = 5, $p < .62$.

TABLE 31

Follow-up Assessment of Probation

Category	Code	Experimental Group (N=29) Relative Frequency	Control Group (N=26) Relative Frequency
Assessment of Probation[a]			
	Helped a lot	52	62
	Helped some	34	23
	Helped very little	14	11
	Did not help at all	0	4

[a] $\chi^2 = 2.01$, df = 3, $p < 56$.

TABLE 32

Kendall Correlation Coefficient for Instructors' Rating Forms between Testing Interval Scores

Scale	Time Intervals	Scale	Time Intervals
Effort	1-2 **	Initiative	1-2 **
	1-3 **		1-3 **
	1-4 **		1-4 **
	2-3 **		2-3 **
	2-4 **		2-4 **
	3-4 **		3-4 **
Maturity	1-2 **	Environmental Awareness	1-2 **
	1-3 **		1-3 **
	1-4 **		1-4 **
	2-3 **		2-3 **
	2-4 **		2-4 **
	3-4 **		3-4 **
Leadership	1-2 **	Determination	1-2 **
	1-3 **		1-3 *
	1-4 **		1-4 *
	2-3 **		2-3 *
	2-4 **		2-4 **
	3-4 **		3-4 **
Competence	1-2 **	Peer Relationship	1-2 **
	1-3 **		1-3 **
	1-4 **		1-4 **
	2-3 **		2-3 **
	2-4 **		2-4 **
	3-4 **		3-4 **

TABLE 31(continued)

Scale	Time Intervals	Scale	Time Intervals
Physical Ability	1-2 **	Staff Relationship	1-2 **
	1-3 **		1-3 **
	1-4 **		1-4 **
	2-3 **		2-3 *
	2-4 **		2-4 **
	3-4 **		3-4 *

Note: Kendall Correlation Coefficient is best for N<30 and when have many tied scores

Note: See Appendix D for definition of scale items

Note: Time intervals - 1; day five of program
2; day ten of program
3; day fifteen of program
4; day twenty (final evaluation)

** p<.001

* p<.01

TABLE 33

Selected Occupational/School Characteristics

Category	Code	Experimental Group (N=29) Relative Frequency	Control Group (N=26) Relative Frequency
School Status[a]			
	Attending	72	77
	Not attending	28	15
	Was, but quit	0	8

a $\chi^2 = 3.20$, df = 3, $p < .20$.

Grade Attending: Jan, 1980[b]			
	8	7	15
	9	41	38
	10	27	15
	11	0	3
	Not attending	24	27

b approx. grade level was grade 9 for both groups.

School Performance[c]			
	Very good (A's)	8	7
	O.K. (passing)	35	35
	Not too bad (passing most)	21	15
	Poorly (failing)	14	15
	Not attending	27	27

c $\chi^2 = 0.24$, df = 3, $p < .99$.

Employment Status[d]			
	Working	14	29
	Not working	79	81
	Was but quit	7	0

d $\chi^2 = 2.01$, df = 2, $p < .56$.

TABLE 33(contined)

Category	Code	Experimental Group (N=29) Relative Frequency	Control Group (N=26) Relative Frequency
Relationship with Father[e]			
	Very good	41	46
	O.K.	10	23
	Not so good	10	19
	No answer	7	12
[e] $\chi^2 = 2.54$, df = 3, $p < .46$.			
Relationship with Mother[f]			
	Very good	41	58
	O.K.	45	39
	Not so good	14	0
	No answer	0	4
[f] $\chi^2 = 5.57$, df = 3, $p < .13$.			

TABLE 34

Experimental Groups Follow-up Assessment of A.C.T.I.O.N. (N=29)

	Response Levels			
Question	Yes A Lot (N) %	Some (N) %	Very Little (N) %	Not at all (N) %
Program helped to stay out of trouble?[a]	(13) 45	(11) 38	(4) 14	(1) 3
Help self feel better about yourself?[b]	(15) 52	(10) 35	(4) 14	
Get along with others better?[c]	(11) 37	(18) 62		

a pearson's R = 0.94 p<.000

b pearson's R = 0.97 p<.000

c pearson's R = 0.95 p<.000

TABLE 35

Interaction with the Law: Peers & Participants

Category	Code	Experimental Group (N=29) Relative Frequency	Control Group (N=26) Relative Frequency
Peer contacts: same friends as in Summer[a]			
	Yes	72	100
	No	28	0

[a] $\chi^2 = 6.32$, df = 1, $p < .01$

Category	Code	Experimental Group (N=29) Relative Frequency	Control Group (N=26) Relative Frequency
Peers contact with Police: since the Summer[b]			
	Yes	45	58
	No	34	23
	Don't know	21	19

[b] $\chi^2 = 1.07$, df = 2, $p < .58$.

Category	Code	Experimental Group (N=29) Relative Frequency	Control Group (N=26) Relative Frequency
Personal Contact with Police (picked-up or stopped by)[c]			
	Yes	41	38
	No	59	62

[c] $\chi^2 = 1.02$, df = 1, $p < .60$.

Category	Code	Experimental Group (N=29) Relative Frequency	Control Group (N=26) Relative Frequency
Charges laid against probationers[d]			
	Yes	17	23
	No	17	15
	Don't know	64	62

[d] $\chi^2 = 0.06$, df = 2, $p < .80$.

Category	Code	Experimental Group (N=29) Relative Frequency	Control Group (N=26) Relative Frequency
Found Guilty[e]			
	Yes	17	23
	No	17	15
	No answer	64	62

[e] $\chi^2 = 0.06$, df = 2, $p < .80$.

TABLE 35 (continued)

Category	Code	Experimental Group (N=29) Relative Frequency	Control Group (N=26) Relative Frequency
Frequency of Police contact(c)[f]			
	0	59	62
	1	14	19
	2	3	8
	3	3	0
	4	8	8
	5	0	0
	6	8	4
	7	0	0
	8	3	0

[f] $\chi^2 = 3.28$, df = 5, $p < .65$.

TABLE 36

Self-Esteem Measure Pre- and Post-Mean Score Comparison of "Successors" (N=25) and "Failures" (N=5) in Experimental Group

Self-Esteem Measure Scales	Pre-Mean Score	Successors/Failures 2-tailed Prob.	Post-Mean Score	2 tailed Prob.
Self-control	3.1/3.2	.74	2.9/3.0	.74
Self-concept	3.3/3.3	.81	3.2/3.5	.30
Social Acceptance	3.0/2.9	.73	2.9/3.0	.77
Anxiety	2.7/2.7	.83	2.8/3.3	.06
Self-awareness	2.8/2.6	.26	3.0/3.2	.32
Self-awareness/ concept II	2.7/2.8	.81	2.9/3.0	.37

TABLE 37

Recidivism Data for Experimental and Control Group

Subject # (Group)	Nature of Delinquency Offence	Probation Officer's Report	Outcome of Charge
Experimental Group			
(1) 29	Theft under $200	- feeling inadequate & poor self-control	6 months probation
(2) 34	Theft under $200	- very dependent of peer support	6 months probation
(2) 35	Trafficing drugs	- superficial & shallow	fined
(2) 38	Shoplifting & assault	- very little support from family	training school
(2) 39	Tehft under $200	- impulsive & steals from family	restitution
Control Group			
53	Auto theft	- rebellious & arrogant	Group home
58	Rape	- sexual hangups	6 months probation
61	Break & enter	- nothing	6 months probation
62	Cooperation	- poor emotional stability	training school
69	Break & enter	- nothing	6 months probation
73	Armed robbery	- family problems	training school
75	Auto theft	- unmanageable behavior	6 months probation

TABLE 37 (continued)

Note: There were three others in the experimental group and two others in control who committed an offence but no actions were taken.

Five (71%) of those attending special schools (i.e., Head Start, vocational school etc.) were the same who recidivated in the follow-up for the experimental group. No data was available for control group.

TABLE 38

Jesness Inventory Pre- and Post-Mean Score Comparison of "Successes"(N=25) and "Failures" (N=5) in Experimental Group

	Successes/Failures			
Jesness Scales	Post mean Score	Two-tailed Prob.level	Post mean Score	Two-tailed Prob.level
Social Maladjustment	24.8/27.4	.35	24.5/25.8	.74
Value Orientation	16.2/18.6	.49	14.9/14.8	.94
Immaturity	13.3/17.0	.05	12.1/15.0	.06
Autism	8.8/10.8	.34	8.8/10.0	.55
Alienation	9.8/11.6	.44	7.4/ 8.4	.68
Manifest Aggression	15.0/15.2	.94	14.8/16.4	.59
Withdrawal	12.1/11.0	.54	11.2/11 6	.83
Social Anxiety	11.8/13.4	.36	13.5/13.4	.95
Repression	3.4/ 5.2	.06	3.4/ 4.4	.29
Denial	11.2/11.6	.82	12.4/13.6	.54

K. Disscusion

Contrary to the propositions and main theorem, the results of this study provide only qualified support for the general premise that the wilderness therapeutic/adventure program (A.C.T.I.O.N.) would serve as a viable alternative to probation for adjudicated (male) juveniles. This is due to the fact that the standardized dependent measures of self-esteem, delinquent attitudes and recidivism, were not unanimously conclusive in indicating significant statistical variations between the experimental and control group. The findings, nevertheless, are consistent with Kaplan (1974), who pointed out that there were obvious changes in the participants he observed, but he questioned the longevity of the program's impact once the youths were returned home; while Kaplan (1979) concluded that although the program he evaluated offered an opportunity to build self-image, the effect appeared to be time-limited. Similarly, Kelly (1974) noted that while there was a significant difference in reconviction rates, shortly after the program, the difference virtually disappeared after the second year of completing the program.

While it may be argued that the standardized personality measures, Jesness Inventory and Self-Esteem Measure, were not sensitive enough, previous results (i.e., Kelly & Baer, 1971;

Vallance & Forrest, 1971) would tend to negate the argument. More realistically, or practically, it appears that while there were some significant changes on a number of the sub-scales at the posttesting period for the experimental group, the program and/or probation did not have any effect on the other areas that were assumed to be theoretically related (i.e., reconvictions or self-esteem). Although intuitively it can be reasoned that a 21-day program can not be expected to have a lasting positive influence on one's attitudes or subsequent behavior (i.e., Berube, 1975), it was expected that the new and structured environment, in which one learns through direct experience and where what one learns is immediately tested and, if workable, reinforces through one's achievement and success, would provide greater operationalized differences for the experimental group in the posttest and possibly follow-up measures.

The observation that any initial differences on the Jesness Inventory and Self-Esteem Measure, in the post measure, did not hold for the 4 to 6 month follow-up period would tend to suggest that the differences measured between the experimental and control group dissipated after the youths had been returned to their natural environment. This has been supported to varying degrees by Kaplan (1979), Kelly (1974), and Krajick (1979). Therefore, it might be suggested that the youth's natural environment does not provide the appropriate reinforcements to sustain the behaviors or attitudes acquired. Nevertheless, the follow-up observations are interesting in that, while most of the studies reviewed showed some statistical differences at the posttest periods for recidivism data few studies have shown that attitudinal and/or behavioral differences persisted over any substantial folow-up period, i.e., one year or more. Therefore, these results lend further support to the observation that the lack of measureable differences at the follow-up period may in part be attributed to the "wearing off" effect on the wilderness program (Kaplan, 1979; Kelly, 1974).

An alternative that has been forwarded by Kaplan (1979) includes the need for "significant others" or some follow-up services, i.e., social workers, parents and/or probation officers, or even a structured residential setting, to help maintain any positive behaviors and/or attitudes acquired through exposure to the program. This model would also complement the behavioral model underlying the wilderness camp in that in order for a new behavior to be sustained it requires reinforcement and monitoring. It is not enough to simply alter someone's attitudes; one has to provide a positive post environment in order to reinforce any changes obtained (i.e., Kaplan, 1979).

Even though the standardized personality inventories did not provide results consistent with similar programs using the same measures, the recidivism data contributed some interesting information that strengthened the main theorem of the research.

For example, despite the rates of reconviction being nearly identical for both the control and experimental groups (approx. 20%), the types of offenses and their outcomes varied substantially between the two groups, as indicated in Table 37. Futhermore, since both groups were considered relatively homogeneous at the pre-test period, the variations in types of subsequent recidivism could in part be accounted for by the effect of the wilderness program. Conversely, since the recidivism data were collected at the 4 to 6 month follow-up period, it appears that there was some persistence of behavioral change for the experimental group.

Recent researchers and practitioners in the field, however, i.e., Arthur, 1975; Cardwell, 1978, as well as those outside the field, i.e., Cicourel, 1976; Gendreau and Leipciger, 1978, have all argued that recidivism measures per se may not necessarily be the best dependent measure of a programs success/failure. As noted earlier, these arguments tend to centre around the ambiguity of defining and interpreting recidivism as well as operationalizing it to the program goals. In fact the association between past delinquent behavior and future delinquent behavior may only be an economic or political consideration at best. Therefore, generalization from the recidivism data should be viewed with caution. One reason for the caution can be attributed to the fact that the primary focus of most wilderness programs is to build self-confidence, self-esteem, respect for nature, perception of self-efficacy, an awareness of peers and adults as well as provide a healthy recreational alternative to the streets (Mazur, 1979), not alleviating recidivism. Notwithstanding the criticisms and realizing the cautions in using recidivism data, it might have been interesting to introduce Glaser's (1964) classification systems for differentiating reconviction into "successes" and "failures". Glaser used four catagories; 1) clear reformation; 2) marginal reformation; 3) marginal failure; and 4) clear recidivists. (See Glaser, 1964: 331-340 for elaboration of the terms). In addition, in accordance with Kelly and Baers' (1971) findings, it would be interesting to extend the recidivism follow-up period to a year or more. Due to time and financial limitations, however, the present study was not able to incorporate an extended follow-up. Otherwise, it is felt that by altering one's negative attitudes and behaviors for more socially acceptable ones they would then act as a catalyst towards reducing further delinquent tendencies. These general assumptions can be related to a number of practical and theoretical explanations. One possible explanations is the social learning theory in which relevant reinforcement agents are brought into effect through modelling effects (Bandura & Walters, 1963); which are consistent with therapeutic approaches which stress individual responsibility (Mowrer, 1963). The therapeutic approaches in turn are consistent with social influence theory and small group theory in attempting to change individual behavior by changing their social structure or group norms (Ash, 1958). They are also consistent with behavior modification techniques in which one is concerned with altering only the present behavior without needing to know the past. Finally, the use of behavior modification techniques are further encouraged by their intuitive appeal and apparent success in wilderness programs (Hobbs & Shelton, 1972) and the dismal record of longer programs based on vocational training and counselling (Wilkins, 1969).

Despite the apparent strong practical and varying theoretical support for wilderness programs no conclusive support has ever been presented showing a positive causal relationship between altering one's behavior and future delinquent behavior. Nevertheless, perhaps for the sake of political expediency, recidivism and per diem costs are still frequently seen as the primary criterion measures of the programs success and funding. But, Cardwell (1978) and Wichmann (1979) among others have suggested that closer scrutiny of the program itself is needed to assess their utility and help discern which variables can be most directly related to program outcome. To accomplish this, arguments can be made for the use of multimodal research designs under a true-experimental setting. While the present study attempted to incorporate a multimodal approach for program evaluation the theoretical and practical assumptions were based on a general nondescript independent variable; wilderness adventure program. Hence, while the dependent measures may have complemented the theoretical approach some of the measures may have been used under conditions that were not conducive to assessing any changes. For example, while the staff evaluations and self-report forms from the probation officers, parents and clients themselves provided a clearer indication of progress and failure, the standardized personality forms did not. Therefore, special consideration should be made as to the generalizability of personality measures to varying program objectives and theoretical premises. The latter point will be elaborated shortly.

The lack of any clear difference between the control and experimental group could also be attributed to a number of other factors as well. Even though the present design was a true-experimental one with a control group, the sample size was considered to be somewhat small for each group. Due to the small sample sizes the experimental groups had to be combined in order to allow for statistical analysis. The small sample may have nullified any differences as a larger variance is needed to obtain any statistical significance with a small sample size (Kerlinger, 1976). For example, Kerlinger (1973) notes how a small sample size can influence the variance in that if the samples are small they are more susceptable to error variance and incorrect rejection of the null hypothesis. Notwithstanding the above limitations, it would have been interesting to have compared the three experimental groups separately as they might have performed differently, as Smith et al. (1975) were able to observe in their evaluation.

Wichmann (1979: 12) has also noted that "assessment of the presence of variability of the independent variable(s)" can be important as they introduce new measures such as program length, staff readiness, and program structure which otherwise are assumed to remain constant. For instance, if there was a significant change in one of the measures which factor then contributed most to the result; the staff, the probationers' peers or one of the program's activities? In the present study, for example, a difference between the experimental groups was observed with respect to which group had the most recidivisms (see Table 36). Group 2 had 80% (4 of 5) of the recidivists, while Group 3 had none. Due to the limitations of the design and measures used however, it was not possible to identify why this phenomenon was observed. (Refer to Tables 36, 37, and 38 for a breakdown of the follow-up reconviction data).

Another extraneous determinant possibly contributing to the lack of any clear cut difference between the two groups is the fact that the study did not control for the types of offenses correctly in that more attention was given to the number of offenses rather than the specific type(s). Therefore, due to the variations in "severity" of offense types any differences in the programs effect may have been even minimized more. For example, Kelly and Baer (1971: 437) noted that "delinquents who are responding to an adolescent crisis rather than to a character defect would profit most from such a program." Consequently, perhaps closer attention needs to be paid to the type of delinquent being referred. This consideration was partly addressed in a post hoc analysis, as presented in Table 36, of the "successes" and "failures" of the experimental group. Unlike the studies by Birkenmayer and Polonoski (1973) and Kelly and Baer (1971), however, none of the measures differentiated the "successes" from the "failures" (see Tables 36 and 38). The only noticeable pre measure difference was school status. The "successes" all attended regular schools while all the "failures" attended special schools for those with learning disabilities (4 of 5, or 80%) (Refer to Table 27 for a breakdown of the pre measure variables assessed). This observation lends further support to the proposition that an adapted wilderness program cannot act as a panacea and that more care is needed in the referral and screening process.

Finally, as there were only a few significant observations over a short period of time it might be postulated that the wilderness program in and of itself is not necessarily that much better for judicial objectives than in offering probation. Nevertheless, the data and model used would tend to support the proposition that the A.C.T.I.O.N. program might better serve as

214

a supplement to probation rather than as a primary alternative. That is, as noted by Kaplan (1979), there appears to be a need for significant others to intervene after a youth has left the program. In order to serve as a supplement for probation the following recommendations might help in the selection process. The recommendations are based on the various findings and limitations observed throughout the study.

General Recommendations

As expressed earlier in the text, the A.C.T.I.O.N. program does appear to act as a viable resource according to the cross-sectional perceptions of those directly and/or indirectly involved in the project. This point has also been recently supported by Markwart (1980). Based on a survey conducted in British Columbia, Markwart observed that probation officers had a stronger preference (62.5%) for having their clients placed in wilderness type attendance programs. Markwart further noted that probation officers felt that the programs were the most beneficial given the other resources available. Rather than identify whether such programs are supported as viable alternatives or resources, however, the "new" issue and direction would seem to involve the need for assessing or monitoring the effectiveness by observing the practical orientation of the program. Even though this concept was first

215

proposed by Kelly and Baer in 1972, it has received little attention since. The technique addresses the issue of what type of youth appears to respond best to such a program; which activities are most "beneficial"; under what circumstances do such programs best operate; what is the ideal length of a course; which methods of program administration are most effective; what type of program evaluation/feedback techniques are best suited for untroublesome use and what is the best screening process for youth referrals? These questions are aimed at articulating the specifics of the program rather than accepting the generalized premise that any wilderness program under the pseudonym of Outward Bound are good for all types of delinquent youths. In short, a process evaluation procedure is proposed. Process evaluation is like a quality control check as it is concerned with checking the program elements. (Franklin and Thrasher, 1976, offer an excellent overview of the components of process evaluation). Golins (1979), for example, in his review of six adventure programs using recidivism as the dependent variable and program stress or intensity (operationally defined as physical stress with a greater subjective impression of psychological stress) as the independent variable observed that the more demanding programs had lower recidivism rates than those less stressful programs. Therefore, the underlying concern is the development of a more sophisticated theory or model to explain the functional agents of such programs. As a number of researchers are beginning to note, i.e., Cardwell, 1978; Kimball, 1979; and Wichmann, 1979, it is no longer enough to merely describe a program and its activities in general terms. And as noted in the three assumptions of causality, as outlined in Selltiz et al. (1976: 115) there must be a plausible and measureable linkage between the goals and/or effects which meet (approximate) the following criteria:

1. There should be covariation between the presumed cause and presumed effect.
2. There should be proper time order, with the cause preceding the effect.
3. One should be able to eliminate all other plausible alternative explanations for the observed relationship.

Another general recommendation includes the use of a follow-up program for the program attendants. If there were some indication of change after the 21-day period but a waning of the changes during the follow-up testing period then deductively it would seem to follow that some form of monitoring with the inclusion of "significant others" would perhaps help to sustain and cultivate any initial changes. To quote Kaplan (1979: 44); "A follow-up program would entail the establishment of a community-based agency. This agency would offer short-term trips, alternative education programs, counseling and community service programs." This approach is also consistent with the eclectic behavior modification approach because once a new behavior has been established some form of interval reinforcement is needed to sustain the observed change (i.e., Adams, 1976). To paraphrase a saying in the physical sciences, "matter can neither be created nor destroyed only altered from one form to another." But unless there is something to keep it in that "form" the behavior may return back to its original "form".

In addition to a follow-up program and process evaluation, a follow-up evaluation is recommended--outcome evaluation: "how have they changed as a result of their experience?" In order to conduct a proper follow-up Franklin and Thrasher (1976) note that a control group matched across the relevant variables must be included to provide a good survey and enable stronger inferences from observed results.

A third recommendation that was derived from the study was the need for a multi-level analysis approach that should include the following aspects:

1. Staff evaluation forms to provide directly obtainable assessments of the clients.
2. Comprehensive background information data so as to refine the referral process and help identify the type of client who would respond best to such a program (i.e., Kelly and Baer, 1971).
3. A parental/"significant other" feedback form by which to

measure post behavior and attitudinal changes.

4. A self-report form for the clients to act as a check on the parents responses and also obtain information of their perceived changes.

Emphasis should also be placed on directly applicable measures rather than standardized ones. While there are a number of problems with using self-report questionnaires and non-standardized personality measures (see, for example, Anastasi, 1976), they are capable of providing adequate indicators of behavioral and attitudinal changes. Some of the researchers who have incorporated their own measures with success into their evaluation of such programs include Kelly and Baer (1968); Mazur (1978) and Smith et al. (1975).

A final general recommendation for future researchers and program directors includes specification of the expected level of success. That is, depending on the type of participant, one should define specific objectives for each participant in addition to the general goals of the program. For example, one client might be continually using profanity, therefore in addition to instilling self-esteem, success may be somewhat dependent on alleviating the abusive language. Program success/failure need not be dependent upon generalized goals, but rather upon specified desired outcomes and levels of success based on staff assessments of the youths. The latter point could also be combined with some predictors as to the duration of the effect of the intervention (i.e., Cardwell, 1978).

Given the present status of wilderness programs the accommadation of the above recommendations would be a difficult task. But, if such programs are going to continue to operate with competence and success, procedures will have to be taken to identify program components and objectives. In addition, such considerations open new avenues for improving the program based on feedback (i.e., Dawson, 1980) from a cross-section of those directly or indirectly involved.

Specific Recommendations

Any program that is going to "survive" the rapidly changing demands of society will have to evolve constantly in order to accommadate the demands placed upon it. A number of specific recommendations that are forwarded are aimed directly at the A.C.T.I.O.N. program while the others may be generalized to similar programs. Not all the recommendations are elaborated upon here, only the major ones. Most of the others are presented in the general and specific highlights section towards the end of this discussion.

First, the program should be designed so that it uses a population which is most representative in relation to those factors theorized to be most relevant to program objectives (Wichmann, 1979). This would require a more astute referral and screening process than currently employed by the program. For example, in 1978 the A.C.T.I.O.N. program was filled simply by the fact that there are openings available--"dumping grounds". And in the 1979 program selection was based on the number of prior offenses rather than type of offenses.

Second, the program should have a detailed descriptive outline of its activities which readily allow the formulation of logical and testable hypotheses based on the theory underlying the explanation for the activities. The point is important because, as noted earlier, one of the common methodological flaws in research of wilderness programs is the failure to be concise in defining the independent variable(s) for measurement. Subsequently, this could lead to poor interpretive and predictive validity as the possibility of identifying the "causal" linkage becomes obscure and the possibility of alternate explanations more plausible (refer to the third criteria of causality in Selltiz et al., 1976: 115). This was illustrated to some degree by the A.C.T.I.O.N. participants who identified certain activities as being more "useful" than others (see Table 19A).

A third recommendation concerns differentiating the political from real objectives of the program. Reduced recidivism for example, although important, is not the primary focus of the program, but rather a preferred by-product. Hence, program success/failure should not rely solely upon recidivism

221

as the evaluative criteria, as did Matheson (1966), Thorvaldson and Matheson (1973), and William and Chun (1973). The present recommendation was also presented at the Sixth Annual Conference of Experiential Education by Gord Cardwell (1978). A supplement to recidivism should include a multilevel recidivism indicator (i.e., Waldo & Chiricos, 1977) as well as qualitative measures covering those behavioral and attitudinal objectives identified by the program. Even the original Outward Bound courses were not directly concerned with "by-products" of the program, but with altering one's self-esteem, self-concept, prescribing proper role models and assuming that some change would result throughout various aspects of one's life as Fletcher (1970) observed.

Fourthly, an interesting recommendation forwarded by the participants' parents suggested that informal follow-up meetings be included and that perhaps the program be supplemented with nondelinquent youths, as well as occasional visits by the police and probation officers. (A summary of the comments can be seen in Appendix O). These augmentations, it was suggested, would help detract from the notion that the adolescents were being labelled and punished. It would also allow them to relate better to their probation officer and the police as well as enable the police and probation officers to see "delinquents" from a different perspective and perhaps bridge any misperceptions.

The key recommendation forwarded by the staff was the need for improved inter-staff communication skills. Team work and clear specification of responsibilities is necessary to operate a "smooth" program. In addition, this consideration complements the basic philosophy of the program that team work is essential. Clear communication between staff members would, according to Golins (1975), maximize role modeling and reduce discrepancies and other factors affecting operational breakdowns. In reference to the recommendation of improving staff communication, some of the staff suggested including a paid staff meeting, not only during each session but also in between each session. The function of the meetings would be four fold:

1. To air staff feelings and conflicts about the programs activities and operation.
2. To examine each course to ensure that it is in keeping with the objectives stated in the manual.
3. To control inconsistencies in staff expectations.
4. To recognize staff "burn-outs" and act upon them.

A further consideration would be to encourage the use of a daily log book so that discussions could be more concrete as well as more specific in nature.

Another recommendation included being receptive to new activities and new techniques. For example, the staff who had been in the 1978 program unanimously agreed that the incorporation of the "push" marathon walk was an excellent addition to the program's agenda. It helped a lot of the participants to vent their frustration as well as helped foster group unity with minimal staff interaction. This opinion was also reflected by the boys themselves in their self-reports at the end of the session.

Although there were more debriefing sessions than in the previous year, it was recommended that after every major activity and especially immediately after any group conflict a debriefing session be held. As noted in Appendix G the debriefing/"gripe" sessions help promote group interaction, openness, self-confrontation, and can serve as an emotional release valve for both the clients and staff.

Finally, as in the classical study by Lewin et al. (1939), it was suggested that future programs should consider selecting staff who present different leadership styles. For example, one staff may be the "autocrat" another the "easy going" (Laissez-faire) type and another the "democratic" type. In this way, the clients are not handled in only one manner. As observed in the present program, some of the boys responded better to one staff than another, perhaps because of different mannerisms. Also, it was strongly recommended that each session have between 8-12 participants with four staff. When compared to the 1978 program, and other literature (i.e., Golins, 1975), this seems to be the most ideal for meeting the program goals and general operation. And last but not least, it was strongly recommended that the staff be augmented with at least one female staff to provide the participants with an opportunity to interact with a women as well as to dispel any illusions that such programs are macho oriented.

Before presenting an overall summary, the highlights of the specific and general recommendations will be itemized.

Highlights of the specific program recommendations:

1. Greater student responsibility.
2. More debriefing sessions held with more staff training for conducting the sessions.
3. Time-offs scheduled throughout the program for the staff.
4. One staff to be female.
5. Improve inter-staff communication network.
6. Provide more recreation time for "crews".
7. All staff meet clients and review their files before start of each session.

Highlights of the general recommendations:

1. Improve follow-up procedures by introducing a follow-up program and outcome evaluation component as well as extend recidivism measures and follow-up period.
2. Use a cross-section of clientele and bring police and probation officers for short visits.

225

3. Specification of dependent variables and choice of measuring instruments.
4. Clear specification of independent variables.
5. Use of at least a comparison group design with pre, post, and follow-up testings across a varied array of variables (multimodal assessment).
6. The principal dependent variables outside of meeting program parameters in the initial screening and referral phase should be the motivation and degree of placeability back into the community (Golins, 1979).

Placement of juveniles should not be based on superficial considerations if the (any) program is going to be of any value.

Summary. Juvenile delinquency more often than not is a nebulous social and legal definition that is neither consistent in identifying nor explaining delinquency. In addition, contrary tc many popular beliefs a dualism between delinquency and nondelinquency does not exist (i.e., Stephenson, 1973). Therefore, trying to identify which type of delinquent (condition of delinquency) would most likely benefit from a wilderness program such as A.C.T.I.O.N. is difficult, and relying solely upon availability of space in placement may also be somewhat dubious given the varied types of delinquency one can encounter. Nevertheless, we try to understand and explain crime and delinquency as well as attempt to provide programs and resources that will hopefully instill attitudes and behaviors

226

that are socially more acceptable, i.e., fewer delinquencies.

The wilderness adventure/therapeutic programs are one such type of resource which generally purport to promote personal growth (individual), social functioning skills (as part of a group and a community) and physical skills. This was based on the basic assumption that "man is a function of his relationship with his surrounding environment" and by placing someone in an action oriented setting they would interact and grow through "the confrontation and resolution of experiences that finds expression in all the aspects of" Outward Bound based programs (Medrick, 1975: 2). As observed in this study and those reviewed, however, few programs are directly replicable due to the nature of their setting, staffing variations, and program objectives. Hence evaluations of such programs may conceivably vary despite appearing similar. While the A.C.T.I.O.N. program debatably appeared to be somewhat effective for some of the probationers, the exact reasons still remained unidentified. Thus the argument for predictive measures (e.g., the Student Rating Form) and the proposition that such programs should perhaps be used to augment probation rather than serve as a sole alternative. The program can be compared to electricity, we know it works but we are not sure why or for whom. Consequently, as research designs become more refined, program objectives more specific, and programs more receptive to using objective evaluation procedures, then more definitive conclusions may be drawn. In the meantime, we must realize the utility of experiential education programs and how they can serve as a "rite-de-passage" for some juvenile delinquents and how they can serve as a functional constructive learning environment as well as provide a structured residential setting. Personal growth is dependent upon enriching experiences and properly constructed experiences may go a long way to helping many in need of such direction. To quote Golins (1979: 43):

> We need not join the legions of the skeptics who are given over a priori to pessimism when it comes to finding solutions to criminality. Adventure education represents a partial, tenable solution.

To the Cynics

Only think how tall and beautiful a beech is
Only think how small and perfect is a bee
Only think how the blossom of the peach is
Do not talk and do not reason, only see.

Only see how delicate a pale moth's wing is
Only see how fair the dappling on a deer
Only see how bright a sunk stone's spreading ring is
Do not deprecate or mock it, only hear.

Only hear how glad the singing of the trush is
Only hear how flying swan's wings, muffled, peal
Only hear how low the wind's long sighing hush is
Do not doubt and do not question, only feel.

Only feel how soft the feather of a lark
Only feel how exquisitely clean the brook
Only feel how firm and living a tree's bark is
Do not argue or discuss it, only look.

Only look how strong and patient the old earth is
Only look how certainly all green things grow
Only look how inexhaustible re-birth is
Do not reason, Only wonder. Only know.

Joan Simpson.

Bibliography

Adams, J.S. Learning and memory. Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1976.

Adams, S. Evaluating research in corrections: Status and prostects. Federal Probation, 1974, 38, 14-21.

Adams, S. Evaluating correctional treatments: Toward a new perspective. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 1977, 4(4), 323-339.

Alexander, J.F., & Parsons, R.J. Short-term behavioral intervention with delinquent families: Impact on family process and recidivism. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1973, 81, 219-225.

Alschuler, A.S. Psychological education. Jounral of Humanistic Psychology, 1969, 1-17.

Allport, F.H. Social Psychology. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1924.

Amos, W.E. The philosophy of probation: Revisted. Federal Probation. 1974, 38, 43-46.

Anastasi, A. Psychological testing (4th ed.). MacMillan Pub. Co., Inc., New York, 1976.

Arthur, M. The survival experience as therapy: An appraisal. Journal of Leisurability, 1975, 2, 3-10.

Ash, S.E. Effects of group pressures upon modification and distortion of judgments. In E.E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, & E.L. Hartley (Eds.). Readings in social psychlogy, (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958, 174-183.

Baer, D.J., Jacobs, P.J., & Carr, F.E. Instructors' ratings of delinquents after Outward Bound survival training and their subsequent recidivism. Psychological Reports, 1975, 36, 547-553.

Bailey, W.C. Correctional outcome: An evaluation of 100 reports. The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science. 1966, 57, 153-160.

Bandura, A., & Walters, R.H. Social learning and personality development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Bandura, A. *Principles of behavior modification*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Barcus, C.G., & Bergeson, R.G. Survival training and mental health: A review. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 1972, *6*, 3-7.

Barkwell, L.J. Differential treatment of juveniles on probation: An evaluation study. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections*, 1976, *18*, 363-378.

Behar, L., & Stephens, D. Wilderness camping: An evaluation of a residential treatment program for emotionally disturbed children. *American J. of Orthopsychiatry*, 1978, *48*(4), 644-653.

Beker, J. The influence of school camping on the self-concepts and social relationships of 6th grade school children. *J. of Educational Psychology*, 1960, *51*, 352-357.

Bell, J.A. Methods of evaluating correctional programs: A review of the literature. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 1974, *7*, 55-63.

Bennett, L.A. The application of self-esteem measures in a correctional setting: Changes in self-esteem during incarceration. *J. of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, Jan. 1974, 9-15.

Bernstein, I.N. Evaluation research in corrections: Status and prospects revisted. *Federal Probation*, 1975, 50-57.

Berube, P. Survival camping: A therapeutic modality. *J. of Leisurability*, 1975, *2*(1), 14-21.

Besharov, M. In C.E. Simonsen; M.S. Gordon III. *Juvenile justice in america*. Glencoe Pub. Co. Inc., 1979.

Bettleheim, B. Mental health and current mores. *American J. of Orthopsychiatry*, 1952, 76-88.

Birkenmayer, A.C., & Polonoski, M. The community adjustment of DARE graduates. Toronto, Ont.: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services, 1973.

Birkenmayer, A.C., & Polonoski, M. The community adjustment of male training school recidivists: The follow-up interviews. Toronto, Ont.: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services, 1975.

Birkenmayer, A.C. The community adjustment of male training school recidivists: The total experience (A description). Toronto, Ont.: Cntario Ministry of Correctional Services, 1976.

Birkenmayer, A.C., & Polonoski, M. A review of alternatives to the incarceration of the youthful offender. Toronto, Ont.: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services, 1976.

Boyd, N. An examination of probation. *Criminal Law Quarterly*, 1978, 355-381.

Brown, W.K. Identifying the educational needs and interests of institutionalized delinquents. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 1975, *27*, 6-9.

Brown, W.K., & Simpson, Jr., B.F. Confrontation of self through outdoor challenge: Pennsylvannia's outdoor experience for juvenile offenders. *Behavior Disorders*, 1976, *2*(1), 41-48.

Brown, W.K., & Simpson, B.F. Group and Individual growth through the out-of-doors. *American J. of Corrections*, Nov/Dec. 1977, *38*, 8-12.

Buros, D.K. *Tests and measurements in child development: Handbook*, vol. 2. Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976, 727-728.

Burton, W.H., & Sarri, R. Where are they now? *Crime and Delinquency*, 1979, *25*(2), 162-176.

Butt, D.S. Jesness Inventory. In D.K. Buros (Ed.), *Eighth mental measurements year book*. Gryphon Press, 1978, 876-878.

Campbell, D.T., & Stanley, J.C. *Experimental and quasi-experimental design for research*, Rand McNally: Chicago, 1963.

Cardwell, G.B. Research and the fallacy of recidivism studies on wilderness programs for troubled youth. Paper presented at the Sixth Annual Conference on Experiential Education, St. Louis, Missouri, September 1978.

Carlson, K.A. Some characteristics of recidivists in an Cntario institution for adult male first incarcerates. *Canadian J. of Criminology and Corrections*, 1973, *15*, 397-408.

Carson, W.M. Canadian therapeutic community for disruptive youths. *International J. of Offender and Comparative Criminology*, 1973, *17*, 268-284.

Cicourel, A.V. *The social organization of juvenile justice*. Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., London, 1976.

Clarke, S.H. What is the purpose of probation and why do we revoke it? *Crime and Delinquency*, October 1979, 407-424.

Clifford, E., & Clifford, M. Self-concepts before and after survival training. *British J. of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 1967, *6*, 241-248.

Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. How to learn from nonclassroom experiences. *Synerist*, 1974, 20-23.

Cook, T.D., & Campbell, D.T. The design and conduct of quasi-experimental and true experiments in field settings. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook in industrial and organizational psychology*, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976, 223-326.

Corrado, R., Blenner-Hassett, M., & Maxim, P. A proposal for research on decision-making discretion in a juvenile court and probation system. Unpublished paper, Simon Fraser University, Dept. of Criminology, Burnaby, British Columbia, 1978.

Costello, J. The group home as an alternative to institutionalization for delinquent and socially maladjusted youth. *Behavior Disorders*, 1975, *1*, 37-44.

Coughlan, D.W.F. The history and function of probation. *Canadian Bar Journal*, June 1963.

Cronin, D.L., & Cronin, D.L. The perseption of juvenile court supervision by offenders, parents, and child. *Crime and Delinquency Literature*, June 1976, 172-173.

Dawson, R. "Feedback/evaluation component of D.A.R.E. program." Unpublished paper to be presented at the Eighth Annual Conference on Experiential Education, Santa Fe, New Mexico, October 1980.

Deaux, R. *The behavior of men and women*, Brooks/Cole Pub. Co., Monterey, California, 1976.

DeCharms, R. Personal causation training in the schools. *J. of Applied Social Psychology*, 1972, *2*(2), 95-113.

Dewdney, M.S. The first year of project SURVIVAL--An evaluation report. New South Wales Dept. of Corrective Services, Sydney, Australia, December 1974.

Dewdney, M.S., & Miner, M.H. Evaluating correctional programs: Methodology in theory and in practice. Australian and New Zealand J. of Criminology, Sept/Dec. 1975, 8, 241-249.

Eitzen, D.S. The self-concept of delinquents in a behavior modification treatment program. The J. of Social Psychology, 1976, 99, 203-206.

Emerson, R.M. Judging delinquents. Aldine Pub. Co., 1969.

Erickson, E.H. Identity: Youth and crises. New York: Newton, 1968.

Eyon, T.G., & Simpson, J.E. The boy's perception of himself in a state training school for delinquent's. The Social Service Review, March 1965, 39(1), 31-37.

Eysenck, S.B.G., & Eysenck, H.J. Personality and recidivism in borstal boys. British J. of Criminology, 1974, 14, 385-387.

Fannin, L., & Clinard, M.B. Differences in the concept of self as a male in lower and middle-class delinquents. Social Problems, 1965, 13, 205-214.

Finchenauer, J.O. Juvenile awareness project: Evaluation report #1 and #2. New Jersey: Department of Corrections, 1979.

Fisher, R.M. Acquiescent response set, the Jesness inventory, and implications for the use of 'foreign' psychological tests. British J. of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1967, 6, 1-10.

Fletcher, B.A. Outward Bound, University of Bristol-school of Education, 1970.

Franklin, J.L., & Thasher, J.H. An introduction to program evaluation. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1976.

Gable, R., & Brown, W.K. Positive outcomes: A new approach to delinquency research. Juvenile and Family Court Journal, August 1978.

Gendreau, P., & Leipciger, M. The development of a recidivism measure and its application in Ontario. Canadian J. of Corrections, 1978, 3-17.

Gendreau, P., Grant, B.A., & Leipciger, M. Self-esteem, incarceration and recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 1979, 67-75.

Gendreau, P., & Ross, B. Effective correctional treatment bibliotherapy for cynics. *Crime and Delinquency*, October 1979, 463-489.

Gibbons, M., & Hopkins, D. How experiential is your experience-based program? *Journal of Experiential Education*, Spring 1980, *3*(1), 32-37.

Glaser, D. *The effectiveness of a prison and parole system*. Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc. 1969, 330-340.

Glaser, D. Achieving better questions: A half century's progress in correctional research. *Federal Probation*, 1975, *39*(3), 3-9.

Glaser, D. Concern with theory in correctional evaluation research. *Crime and Delinquency*, April 1977, *23*(2), 173-179.

Glueck, S., & Glueck, E. *Toward a typology of juvenile offenders*. New York: Grune & Strafton, 1970.

Golins, G.L. Notes on do's and don'ts of selecting and orienting delinquents for participation in an Outward Bound course. In *Outward Bound in corrections: A compilation*, October 1975.

Golins, G.L. A resource document on design and managing Outward Bound courses for delinquent probationers. In *Outward Bound in corrections: A compilation*, Colorado Outward Bound school, 1977.

Golins, G.L. Utilizing adventure education to rehabilitate juvenile delinquents. Colorado Outward Bound School, Denver, Colorado, 1979.

Gomolak, L. Students boost themselves at Outward Bound. *Nation's Schools*, 1973, *91*(6), 46-48.

Gonzales, M.R. Organized camping: A therapeutic tool for the juvenile delinquent. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 1972, *6*, 89-93.

Gottfredson, D.M. Assessment and prediction methods in crime and delinquency. From: *Task force report on juvenile delinquency and youth crime*. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967.

Gottfredson, D.M. Research-Who needs its? Crime and Delinquency, January 1971, 11-22.

Gottredson, M.R. Treatment destruction techniques. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 1979, 16, 39-54.

Griffiths, C.T. The source of variability in juvenile court decision-making: An organizational analysis. Unpublished Phd. dissertation, University of Montana, 1977.

Hackler, J.C. The great stumble forward. Methuen: Toronto, 1978.

Hall, C.S., & Lindzey, G. Personality. New York: J.Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970.

Haridson, J., Curran, J.D., & Jardine, E. The use of the Jesness inventory with a Northern Ireland population. British Journal of Criminology, October 1978, 18(4), 387-390.

Haskell, M.R., & Yarblonsky, L. Crime and delinquency, Chicago: Rand Mcnally and Co., 1970, 226-509.

Heilmann, C.E. Open prisons, British style. The Prison Journal, Autumn/Winter 1978, 58(2), 3-17.

Hemple, W.E., Webb Jr., W.H., & Reynolds, S.W. Research prediction scales for probation. Federal Probation, June 1976, 33-37.

Hileman, M.A. An evaluation of an environmental stress-challenge program on the social attitudes and recidivism behavior of male delinquent youth. Unpublished Master's thesis, Southern Illinois University-C, 1979.

Hobbs, T.R., & Shelton, G.C. Therapeutic camping for emotionally disturbed adolescents. Hospital and Community Psychiatry, October 1972, 23(10), 298-302.

Hogan, J.M. Impelled into experience. Educational Productions Ltd., Wakefield, Yorkshire, 1968.

Hood, R., & Sparks, R. Key issues in criminology. Work University Library, London, 1970, chpt.1.

Hopkins, D. Self concept and adventure. Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Sheffield, England, September 1976.

Howe, H. II. The role of experience in education. In Major papers presented at the Conference of Experiential

Education, Estes Park, Colorado, 1974.

Jayewardene, C.H., Lang, S., & Gainer, C. Changing attitudes to the criminal justice system through formal education. *Crime and Justice*, August 1977, 126-129.

Jesness, C.F. The preston typology study. *J. of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 1971, *8*, 38-52.

Jesness, C.F. *The Jesness Inventory manual*. Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, California, 1972.

Kaplan, L. Outward Bound: A treatment modality unexplored by the social work profession. *Child Welfare*, 1979, *48*(1), 37-47.

Kaplan, R. Some psychological benefits of an outdoor challenge program. *Environment and Behavior*, 1974, *6*(1), 101-116.

Kelly, F.J., & Baer, D.J. Outward Bound schools as an alternative to institutionalization for adolescent delinquent boys. U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare Office of Education, 1968.

Kelly, F.J., & Baer, D.J. Jesness inventory and self-concept measures for delinquents before and after participation in Outward Bound. *Psychological Reports*, 1969, *25*, 719-724.

Kelly, F.J. The effectiveness of survival camp training with delinquents. *American J. of Orthopsychiatry*, 1971, *41*(2), 305-306.

Kelly, F.J., & Baer, D.J. Physical challenge as a treatment for delinquents. *Crime and Delinquency*, October 1971, 437-445.

Kelly, F.J. Outward Bound and delinquency: A ten year experience. Paper presented at the Conference on Experiential Education, Estes Park, Colorado, October 1974.

Kelly, H. Work hard and hope for miracles too. *Federal Probation*, 1970, *34*(4), 26-29.

Kenny, D.A. A quasi-experimental approach to assessing treatment effects in the nonequivalent control group design. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1975, *82*(3), 345-362.

Kerlinger, F.N. *Foundation of behavioral research* (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Kesselheim, A.D. A Kurt Hahn primer. In *Kurt Hahn and the* *development of Outward Bound: A compilation of essays*, Colorado Outward Bound Schools, 1976.

Kimball, R.O. *Wilderness experience program: Final evaluation report*. Santa Fe: State of New Mexico Forensic System, 1979.

Kitchener House Inc. Community based response to the criminal justice system proposal. An unpublished review and summary of a paper advocating the need for community based correctional centres, Kitchener, Ontario, 1977.

Krajick, K. Working our way home. *Corrections Magazine*, 1978, *4*(2), 32-35.

Langley, M., Thomas, B.J., & Parkinson, R. Youths' expectations and perceptions of their initial juvenile court appearance. *Canadian J. of Criminology*, January 1978, *20*(1), 43-53.

Lemire, Jean-Marc. Changes in self-concept and perception of others among participants of an Outward Bound program. *J. of Leisurability*, January 1975, *4*(2), 16-23.

Levine, R.A., & Campbell, D.T. *Ethnocentrism*. New York Wiley, 1972.

Lewin, K., Lipitt, R., & White, R.K. Patterns of aggresive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1939, *10*, 271-299.

Liazos, A. School alienation and delinquency. *Crime and Delinquency*, July 1978, 355-370.

Lingle, K.I. Alternatives for youth-at-risk. *Camp Magazine*. May 1980, 15-25.

Linsky, A.S. Stimulating responses to mailed questionnaires: A review. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, Spring 1975, *39*(1), 82-101.

Loughmiller, L.C. *Wilderness road*. Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, Austin, Texas, 1965.

Lundman, R.J., & Scarpitti, F.R. Delinquency prevention: Recommendations for future projects. *Crime and Delinquency*, April 1978, 207-220.

MacDonald, J.A. Juvenile training schools and juvenile justice policy in British Columbia. *Canadian J. of Criminology*, 1977, 418-438.

Madden, P.G. Extracting data on returns from placement from juvenile information systems. Ministry of Correctional Services province of Ontario: Planning and Research Branch, November 1976.

Magee, C. Camp Tawingo: A private camp serving public outdoor education needs in Ontario. J. of Outdoor Education, 1977, 12, 19-21.

Manfrum, C.T. The humanity of the probation officers. Federal Probation, 1972, 36, 47-50.

Margolin, E. Work and play-are they really opposites? The Elementary School Journal, 1967, 67(7), 343-353.

Markwart, A. Containment/remand study: Report to branch management. Report presented to branch management of the Attorney Generals department of British Columbia, Maple Ridge, B.C., Canada, April 1980.

Marshall, T.F. An investigation of the delinquent self-concept theory of Reckless and Dinitz. British J. of Criminology, 1976, 16, 227-235.

Martinson, R. What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. The Public Interest, 1974, 35, 22-54.

New Martinson/Wilks analysis shows that recidivism is much lower than previously believed-and dropping. Criminal Justice Newsletter, 1976, 7(21), 1-2.

Martinson, R. Martinson attacks his own earlier work. Criminal Justice Newsletter, December 1978, 9, 4.

Mason, J.A. Uncertain outposts: The future of camping and the challenge of its past. Camping Magazine, Sept./Oct. 1978, 13-31.

Matheson, M.A. Search and leadership training for young offenders at Lakeview forest camp. Canadian J. of Corrections, 1966, 8, 237-245.

Maynard, A.L. Outward Bound: Nature as teacher. Saturday Review, May 1969, 17, 76-77.

Mazur, R.S. Proposal for summer wilderness adventure program: A.C.T.I.O.N. 1978. Unpublished paper for the Juvenile Probation and Aftercare Services, Kitchener, Ontario, April 1978.

239

Mazur, R.S. Evaluation of the summer wilderness adventure program: A.C.T.I.O.N. 1978. Unpublished paper for the Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services, Kitchener, Ontario, 1978.

Mazur, R.S. Proposal for summer wilderness adventure program A.C.T.I.O.N. 1979. Probation and Aftercare Services, Kitchener, Ontario, April 1979.

Medrick, F.W. *Outward Bound and higher education*. Colorado Outward Bound School, Denver, Colorado, 1975.

Milan, M.A., & McKee, J.M. Behavior modification: Principles and applications in corrections. In D. Glaser (Ed.), *Handbook of criminology*. Chicago: Rand McNally College Pub. Co., 1974, 746.

Mitchell, V., & Crawford, I. *Camp counseling*. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders Co., 1950.

Moberg, D.O., & Ericson, R.C. A new recidivism outcome index. *Federal Probation*, 1972 *36*, 50-57.

Mohoruk, D. Juvenile camp a rescue story for youths-and their parents. In: *Corrections Newsletter*. Victoria: British Columbia Ministry of Attorney General, January 1980, *4*(1), 5-7.

Monashesi, S. Prediction factors in probation. In F.H. Simon, *Prediction methods in criminology*. Home Office Research Studies, London, 1971.

Mondschein, D. They can: Camping. *Academic Therapy Quarterly*, 1966-67, *2*(2), 101-103, 126.

Montgomery, J.D. Alternatives and decisions in educational planning. UNESCO publication, London, 1976.

Morris, N. *The future of imprisonment*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Mowrer, O.H. *The new group therapy*. Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1964.

Murray, C.A., & Cox, L.A., Jr. *Beyond probation: Juvenile corrections and the chronic delinquent*. Beverly Hills: SAGE publications, 1979, No. 94.

McKissack, I.J., & Simcock, R.M. Delinquency, hostility and the effects of institutional training. Australian and New Zealand J. of Criminclogy, September/December 1975, 8, 231-234.

McNeil, E.E. The background of therapeutic camping. The J. of Social Issues, 1957, 13, 3-15.

The national outdoor leadership school-catalogue of courses/1980. Lander, Wyoming: NOLS Publications.

Nelson, J.R., & Richardson, F. Perenial problems in criminological research. Research, Crime and Delinquency, 1971, 23-31.

Nettler, G. Reply to Corrado and Roesch. Canadian Journal of Criminology, January 1980, 137-138.

Nie, N.H., Hull, C.H., Jenkins, J.G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D.H. SPSS: Statistical package for the social sciences(2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1975.

Nold, J., & Wilpers, M. Wilderness training as an alternative to incarceration. In C.R. Dodge (Ed.), A nation without prisons, Lexington Books, Lexington, Massachusetts, 1975, 115-169.

Ministry of corrections services annual report of the minister for the year ending 31st march; 1970, 1976, 1977, 1978. Toronto, Ont.: Ministry of Correctional Services.

Operation I.M.P.A.C.T.: Proposal for probationer's program at project D.A.R.E. Ministry of Community and Social Services; Children's Service Division, January 1979. (A draft for discussion purposes).

Outward Bound in corrections: A compilation. Colorado Outward Bound Schools, 1977.

Outward Bound in Canada, Brochure outlining programs in Canada, 1979. (pamphlet).

Palmer, T. Martinson revisted. J. of Research in Crime and Delinquency, July 1975, 133-152.

Partington, J. Project WILD: A wilderness learning experience for high delinquent risk youth. J. of Leisurability, April, 1977, 4(2), 34-41.

Petzoldt, P. Adventure education: The national outdoor. J. of

Outdoor Education, 1975, *10*, 3-7.

Platt, J.S., Reusser, P.R., Regan, M.K., & Simpson, R.L. The effects of tutoring on the academic achievement, self-concept and social behavior of delinquent adolescent males. *J. of Correctional Education*, 1976, *29*(1), 10-13.

Polonoski, M. The community adjustment of male training school recidivists: The total experience. Toronto, Ont.: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services, 1976.

Porter, W. The development and evaluation of a therapeutic wilderness program for problem youth. Master's thesis, University of Denver, March 1975. Published by Colorado Outward Bound School, Denver, Colorado.

Quay, H.C. The three faces of evaluation. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, December 1977, *14*, 341-354.

Reckless, W.C., & Dinitz, S. Pioneering with self-concept as a vulnerability factor in delinquency. *J. of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, December 1967, *58*, 517-540.

Reckless, W.C. *American criminology: New directions*. Appleton-Century-Crofts Meridith Corp., 1973.

Redl, F., & Wineman, D. *The aggressive child*. Glencoe, Illinois, Free Press, 1957.

Renner, J. The juvenile probationer in Ontario. Toronto, Ont.: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services, 1978.

Rhode, W.L. New york state division for youth: Higher horizons program. *American J. of Correction*, March/April 1972, 39.

Rice, B. Going to the mountain. *Psychology Today*, December 1979, *13*(7), 65-81.

Richards, P., Berk, R.A., & Forster, B. *Crime and play: Delinquency in a middle-class suburb*. Ballinger Pub. Co., Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1979.

Roesch, R., & Corrado, R. The policy implications of evaluation research: Some issues raised by the Fishman study of rehabilitation and diversion services. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 1979, *70*, 530-541.

Rogers, C. *Carl Rogers on encounter groups*. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Rohrs, H., & Tunstall-Behrens, H. The educational thought of Kurt Hahn. In Kurt Hahn and the development of Outward Bound: A compilation of essays, 1976.

Rosenberg, F.R., & Rosenberg, M. Self-esteem and delinquency. J. of Youth and Adolescence, 1978, 7, 279-291.

Rosenfeld, E. A research-based proposal for a community program of delinquency prevention. American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1959, 322, 136-145.

Ruch, F.L., & Zimbardo, P.G. Psychology and life (8th ed.). Scott, Foresman and Co., Glenview, Illinois, 1970, 640-651.

Rutherford, A. The dissolution of the training schools in Massachusetts. Academy of Contemporary Problems, 1974.

Sarason, J.G. Personality: An objective approach. Toronto: Wiley, 1972, 90-102.

Selltiz, C., Wrightsman, L.S., & Cook, S.W. Research methods in social relations (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Sepler, H.J. The next twenty-five years facing the criminal justice system: Using standard celeration charting for systems analysis. American J. of Criminal Law, March 1979, 47-66.

Shane, H.G. Education for tomorrows world. The Futurist, June 1973, 103-106.

Shore, A. Outward Bound. Outward Bound Inc., New York, New York, 1977. (A reference volume).

Silvernail, D.L. Adapting education to a changing world. The Futurist, December 1977, 375-376.

Simon, F.H. Prediction methods in criminology. Home Office Research Studies, London, 1971.

Skiff, W.D. Key to marketing Outward Bound as a viable alternative to incarceration. In Outward Bound in corrections: A compilation, Denver Colorado: Colorado Outward Bound Schools, 1977.

Smith, M.L., Gabriel, R., & Anderson, R.D. Final report: Project to design an evaluation of Outward Bound. Bureau of education field services, University of Colorado, 1973.

Smith, M.L., & Gabriel, R. Evaluation of effects of Outward Bound. An unpublished report through the School of Education, University of Colorado, 1975.

Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada. Selected trends in Canadian criminal justice. Paper prepared for Federal Provincial Conference of Ministers responsible for Criminal Justice; Ottawa, Canada, October 1979.

Sosin, M., & Sarri, R. Due process: Reality or myth? In E.F. Cromwell Jr., et al. (Eds.), *Introduction to juvenile delinquency*. 1977, 241-270.

Stephenson, P.S. Myths about juvenile delinquency. *Canadian J. of Criminology and Corrections*, 1973, *15*(1), 83-92.

Stewart, W.A.C. The slackening tide: The thirties and Gordonstoun. In *Kurt Hahn and the development of Outward Bound: A compilation of essays*, 1976.

Strom, R. Education for a leisure society. *The Futurist*, April 1975, 93-97.

Templin, G.T., & Balwin, A.W. Evaluation and adaptation of Outward Bound: 1920-1976. In *Kurt Hahn and the development of Outward Bound: A compilation of essays*, 1976, part 2.

Theis, H.E. Factors related to the delinquency, identity and self-esteem of incarcerated male delinquents. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1975, 73. (summary).

Theobald, R. An alternative future for America's third century. *The Futurist*, June 1977, 188-190.

Thorvaldson, S.A., & Matheson, M.A. The Boulder Bay experience. Criminal justice planning and research unit, British Columbia: Ministry of the Attorney-General, 1973.

Vallance, R.C., & Forrest, A.R. A study of the Jesness personality inventory with Scottish children. *British J. of Educational Psychology*, 1971, *41*(3), 338-344.

Ventura, M.A., & Dundon., M. A challenging experience in canoeing and camping as a tool in approaching the drug problem. *Social Work*, July 1963, 3-15.

Vinter, R.D. Analysis of treatment organizations. *Social Work*, July 1963, 3-15.

Waldo, G.P. Myths, misconceptions and the misuse of statistics in correctional research. *Crime and Delinquency*, January 1971, 57-66.

Waldo, G.P., & Chiricos, T.G. Work release and recidivism. *Evaluation Quarterly*, February 1977, *1*(1), 87-107.

Warren, M.C. Classification of offenders as an aid to efficient management and effective treatment. *J. of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*. 1971, *62*, 239-258.

Whiting, J.W.M., Kluckhohn, R., & Anthony, A. The function of male initiation ceremonies at puberty. In E.E. Maccoby; T.M. Newcomb, & E.L. Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in social psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958, 359-370.

Wichmann, T.F. Evaluation of the Outward Bound model as delinquency intervention. Unpublished paper, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois, December 1979.

Wilkins, L. *Evaluation of the penal measures*, Random House, New York, 1969.

Wilks, J., & Martinson, R. Is the treatment of criminal offenders really necessary? *Federal Probation*, March 1976, 3-9.

Willman, Jr., H.C., & Chun, R.Y.F. Homeward Bound: An alternative to the institutionalization of adjudicated juvenile offenders. *Federal Probation*, September 1973, 52-58.

Winter, W.D., & Winter, L.M. Therapeutic camping an experiment in group living. *Corrective Psychiatry and J. of Social Therapy*, November 1966, *12*(6), 449-458.

Witherspoon, A. Foster home placement for juvenile delinquents. *Federal Probation*, 1966, *30*, 48-52.

Wolfgang, M. et al. *The sociology of crime and delinquency* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley, 1970.

Wohlwill, J.F. The emerging discipline of environmental psychology. *American Psychologist*, 1970, *25*, 303-312.

Wright, W.I., & Dixon, M.C. Community prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, January 1977, *14*(1), 35-67.

Wylie, R.G. The present status of self theory. In E.F. Borgatta, and W.W. Lamberts (Eds.), Handbook of personality theory and research. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1968, 728-787.

APPENDIX A

Background Information

217

FROM: Ministry of Community and Social Services

CAMP ACTION

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

NAME:

Date of Birth:

ADDRESS:

TELEPHONE NUMBER:

NEXT OF KIN:

OFFENCE:

PRESENTING PROBLEM:

PHYSICAL PROBLEMS:

EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS:

REASON FOR SENDING TO A.C.T.I.O.N.

RECOMMENDED GROUP (if necessary): 1 2 3 4 5

Date

Probation/Aftercare Officer

APPENDIX B

Consent Form, Covering Letter,

Contract Form, Evaluation Contract,

School Release Agreement,

Personal Equipment Check List,

Medical History Form and Medical Consent Form,

Parental/Guardian Consent Form,

Parental/Guardian Participation Form.

FROM:Ministry of Community and Social Services - ACTION PROGRAM

May 9, 1979

Dear

The Kitchener Juvenile Probation & Aftercare Services, Ministry of Community & Social Services is conducting three, 21 day Wilderness Adventure Programs at Project D.A.R.E., South River, Ontario, from June 12, 1979 to August 29, 1979. In addition, the program will also be evaluated by one of the staff, Mr. John Winterdyk, in an effort to measure the program's success. We hope that your son will be able to attend the program in order that he may benefit from the experience.

The program will be named Program A.C.T.I.O.N. (Accepting Challenge Through Interaction with Others & Nature) and will be under the leadership of trained competent staff of the Ministry of Community & Social Services. Your son will be taught bushcraft skills, survival skills and the various aspects of environmental science through the means of adventure and challenge.

This wilderness program will involve the topics of conservation, geography, wildlife and plant identification. Included among these activities are morning run and dip into the lake, backpacking, orienteering, rock-climbing, kayaking, canoeing as well as the use of an obstacle course and a number of other components. The program will also include in the final stage, a three day solo experience by your son where he will experience being in the wilderness on his own. All events mentioned above are held under the close supervision of the staff and all safety regulations are strictly maintained. We do our utmost to guard the health and welfare of your son.

Through these adventurous and challenging activities, it is hoped that your son will develop an appreciation of nature and himself. In addition, it is felt that your son will be better aware of his potential through achievement and discovering new personal qualities. Attempts are also being made to have this program recognized as an outdoor education school credit, but there are no guarantees that this will come into effect.

The evaluation of the program in which both you and your son will be asked to volunteer, will provide information about how successful the program is for those who participate. It is therefore important to have both your cooperation. The consent forms that you will be asked to complete will clarify the nature of cooperation sought. The purpose of the evaluation will be to test whether wilderness programs are beneficial as a learning experience.

The results of the research project will be available in May, 1980. A summary will be made available to you at that time should you make a request for it. Hence, with your assistance, wilderness programs for you in K-W area may become a permanent endeavor.

Enclosed with this letter are: a medical form, school records release form, parental/guardian consent form, personal equipment list, as well as a copy of the contract your son will be required to sign before going to camp. All forms are to be completed in order for your son to attend Program A.C.T.I.O.N. Upon completion of the forms please forward the signed documents to the Probation Office.

If there are any questions concerning Program A.C.T.I.O.N. on the evaluation project, please contact your son's Probation Officer, Mr. Winterdyk or Mr. Rick Mazur at 744-6571.

Sincerely,

(signed) Richard S. Mazur

Richard S. Mazur
Probation/Aftercare Officer

(signed) John A. Winterdyk

John A. Winterdyk
A.C.T.I.O.N. Staff/Program Evaluator

CAMP A.C.T.I.O.N.

CONTRACT

I, ________________________________ have been informed as to the nature of the A.C.T.I.O.N. program. I fully realize that it is not a typical summer camp and understand that while at A.C.T.I.O.N. I will find myself in physically challenging and psychologically stressful situations, including the following activities:

Morning runs and dips
Climbing/Rappelling
Aerial Course
Skill learning sessions
Solos
Marathon
Orienteering
Canoe-tripping
Obstacle Course
Wide Games

With the above activities in mind, I voluntarilly agree to commit myself to the A.C.T.I.O.N. program in the following ways:

1. To try everything to the best of my ability.
2. To be responsible for myself and my equipment.
3. To trust and cooperate with my instructors and other group members
4. To complete the A.C.T.I.O.N. program as prescribed by my instructors.

Also, I understand that this program is now a term of my Probation Order and that I am required to be at the Probation Office on the day of departure for Camp A.C.T.I.O.N. with the necessary equipment, or face the possible consequences.

DATE OF CONTRACT: ________________________________

STUDENT'S SIGNATURE: ________________________________

JUDGE: ________________________________

PROBATION OFFICER: ________________________________

From: Ministry of Community and Social Services - ACTION PROGRAM

Evaluation Contract

I have been informed and understand that the program will be evaluated for it's effectiveness and that the information I provide will be an important part of the program. This contract affirms my intention to participate in the following:

1. To answer a set of questionnaires before and after the program.
2. To be either interviewed or to fill out another questionnaire at Christmas time, and again in May.

I understand that all information will be used confidentially and that no individual names will be attached or used in connection with any of the information provided. Further, I am aware the researcher agrees not to release any information concerning myself or my family to any other party. I therefore agree to provide honest and accurate information to the best of my ability.

Also, I understand that the researcher hereby agrees to pay ____________ $3.50 at Christmas and again in May for participating in the interview and questionnaires.

Date of Contract ______________________________

Student's signature ______________________________

Program Evaluator ______________________________

FROM: Ministry of Community and Social Services - ACTION PROGRAM

School Records Release Agreement

In conjunction with the Ministry of Community & Social Services, John Winterdyk, a staff member of program A.C.T.I.O.N., will be examining the effectiveness of the A.C.T.I.O.N. program for the local youths. In order that we may complete the evaluation, we require your permission to examine and record the attendance records and yearly grade of __________ ________________. Any such information received will be used confidentially and no individual names will be used in connection with it. This permission will include the school years 1975-76, 78-79. Your signature, to appear below, will be recognized as your written approval to examine the required school information.

Name of School: ____

Address: ____

____

Student's signature: ____________________________________

Parent's/Guardian's Signature: ____________________________________

Date of Consent: ____

CAMP A.C.T.I.O.N.

PERSONAL EQUIPMENT CHECK LIST

The following articles are suggested for your son's participation in the wilderness adventure program.

( )	1	sleeping bag
( )	2 pr.	running shoes (important)
( )	5 pr.	heavy socks
( )	6	underwear
( )	2	shorts or cut-offs
( )	1	bathing suit
( )	3	jeans or long pants
( )	3	shirts
( )	4	T-shirts
( )	1	sweatshirt
( )	1	warm jacket
( )	1 pr.	hard shoes, work boots, or hiking boots
( )	1	raincoat
( )	1	hat (protection from sun)
( )	1	insect repellent (i.e. muskol, D15 at the hardware store)
( )	1	toothbrush
( )	1	toothpaste
( )	1	comb or brush
( )	1	bar soap
( )	3	towels
( )	1	suntan lotion (optional)
( )	6	plastic garbage bags

He should not bring the following articles: money, watches, rings or other valuable personal effects which may be lost.

All personal articles should be marked with your son's name for identification purposes. It is suggested that clothing be placed in a knapsack, flight bag, duffle bag or pillow case rather than a suitcase. A plastic garbage bag should be used as a liner to help prevent damage from dampness.

No ready made cigarettes will be allowed at the camp. If your son wishes to smoke then he will have to provide his own tobacco and cigarette papers.

FROM: Ministry of Community and Social Services

CAMP ACTION

MEDICAL HISTORY FORM

Pleae complete form and return to the above address with the Consent Form, in order that your son be allowed to attend Camp ACTION.

NAME OF YOUTH: ______________________________

Height: __________

Weight: __________

Build: __________

General Health: ______________________________

Date of Last Medical Examination: ______________

Doctor's Name: ______________________________

OHIP Number: ______________________________

ALLERGIES	Yes	No	If yes, please specify
Food	___	___	______________________
Drugs	___	___	______________________
Other (insects, pollen, etc.)	___	___	______________________

Is there any history of epilepsy, fainting spells, phobias (heights?) or other disabilities?

Yes ___ No ___

If yes, please describe in detail: ______________________________

____

Has your child been immunized against:

	Yes	No	When?
Tetanus & Diphtheria	___	___	______________________
Pertussis	___	___	______________________
Smallpox	___	___	______________________
Measles	___	___	______________________

FROM: Ministry of Community and Social Services

CAMP ACTION

MEDICAL HISTORY FORM

CONSENT FORM

I hereby give my consent for any medical attention, surgery or general anaesthetic that may be deemed necessary for my son ______________________

SIGNATURE: ______________________

RELATIONSHIP: ______________________

DATE: ______________________

*Please attach doctor's certificate indicating your son's fitness to attend Camp A.C.T.I.O.N.

FROM Ministry of Community and Social Services

CAMP ACTION

PARENTAL/GUARDIAN CONSENT FORM

I have read your letter and am fully aware of the program activities and requirements for my son to attend Camp ACTION.

In agreement with the aims, purpose and objectives of Camp ACTION, I herewith give my permission for

____

(name of child)

to attend the camp from ____________________ to ____________________ and release and save harmless the staff of the Ministry of Community and Social Services and their agents, and the Province of Ontario, from all claims of whatsoever nature arising therefrom.

Signature of Parent/Guardian ______________________________

____

Relationship ______________________________

Date ______________________________

FROM: Ministry of Community and Social Services - ACTION PROGRAM

Parent/Guardian Participation Form

I, , have read the information letter and am aware that the evaluation is an important component of the program's future continuation.

I would therefore like to offer my assistance by volunteering to fill out a questionnaire or participate in an interview to be conducted for the benefit of the program. The question's will be related to my son's progress since the program.

Sould I be called upon, I would be willing to take part during the Christmas holidays, 1979 and possibly in May, 1980, to either be interviewed or to fill out the questionnaire. The sessions will last approximately 20-30 minutes each.

I understand that all information I provide will be used confidentially and that any information I offer may not be used for any other purpose other than the evaluation. Neither my name nor that of any other person that I might mention will be printed or released in any manner.

Signature of Parent/Guardian: ______________________________

Date: ____________________

APPENDIX C

Procedure for Testing Control Group:
Instructions for the Probation Officers.

Procedures for testing control group:
Instructions for the Probation Officers

Objective: to gather data on a sample of 30 boys, ages 14-16

:no severe emotional, psychological or physical disabilities.
:could have possibly gone to the A.C.T.I.O.N. program if no other personal commitments present.

Incentive: they will be paid $3.50 to return at Christmas and possible again in May, for retesting (I will supervise this probably).

Precedure: once you have received individual cooperation have him fill out either Part A or B and the Jesness Inventory after having read the instructions to him.

: they must answer all questions; would help if could supervise or be close to answer any questions they might have. If they are having difficulty reading the questions aloud could help.

: the entire questionnaire filling-out session should take about 20-30 minutes.

: after completing the forms set another appointment for 19-22 days hence, for retest...if used Part B first time use part A on the retest.

: fill out the background information sheets on each boy.

: if the boy enquires as to the purpose of the study tell him that it is meant to determine how well he faired on probation compared to those boys who attended the A.C.T.I.O.N. program. In other words it is hoped that the boys are made aware of what they are doing.

*****if you need any further information please feel free to ask Rick or myself during the Summer.

P.S. It would be appreciated if you could collect as many boys for the control group as possible before the end of the Summer.

232

APPENDIX D

Description of Jesness Inventory Sub-scales

Description of Sub-Scales

1. Social Maladjustment -sm (63 items) refers to a set of attributes association with unfulfilled needs, as defined by the extent to which an individual shares the attitudes of persons who demonstrate inability to meet, in socially approved ways, the demands of their environment.

2. Value Orientation -vo (39 items) refers to a tendency to hold values characteristic of persons in the lower social classes.

3. Immaturity -imm (45 items) refers to the tendency to display attitudes and perceptions of self and others which are usual for persons of a younger age.

4. Autism -au (28 items) refers to a tendency in thinking and perceiving to distort reality according to one's personal desires or needs.

5. Alienation -al refers to the presence of distrust and estrangement in a person's attitudes towards other, especially towards persons representing authority.

6. Manifest Aggression -ma (31 items) refers to an awareness of unpleasant feelings especially of anger or frustration, a tendency to react readily with emotion, and perceived discomfort concerning the presence and control of these feelings.

7. Withdrawal -wd (24 items) involves a perceived lack of satisfaction with self and others and a tendency toward passive escape or isolation from others.

8. Social Anxiety -sa (24 items) is defined as the perceived emotional discomfort associated with inter-personal relationships.

9. Repression -rep (15 items) refers to the exclusion from conscious awareness of feelings and emotions which the individual normally would be expected to experience, or his failure to label these emotions.

10. Denial -den (20 items) refers to the failure to acknowledge unpleasant events or aspects of reality normally encountered in daily living.

11. Asocialisation, as measured by the Asocial Index, refers to a generalised disposition to resolve problems in social and personal adjustment in ways ordinarily regarded as showing a disregard for social customs or rules. It is calculated from weighted scores on the other sub-scales.

—Vallance and Forrest, 1971, p.344.

APPENDIX E

A & B Self-Esteem Forms and Definition of Sub-Scales

235

Definition of Self-esteem Measure
Sub-scales

1. self-control: control over himself and/or environment
2. self-concept: personal perception with regard to physical, intellectual and social skills
3. social acceptance: perceived competence of interpersonal skills
4. anxiety: general areas of unconfortability
5. self-awareness: evidence of self-examination and analysis and is aware of his emotions, abilities, potential and limitation
6. self-assertion: a person scoring high on this scale will be active rather than passive, will assume leadership and responsibility, generally expresses confidence to act on own environment (this scale was not identified although items had been selected for it).
7. self-awareness/concept: a person scoring high on this scale will endorse statements which indicate his perception and value of himself, his perception of himself as neither vastly superior nor inferior to others. He will not endorse self-deprecating comments, nor will he report fears of judgement by others.

Source:Porter (]975) and Smith et al (]975)

PART A

SA - Strongly agree with the statement.
A - Agree with the statement
NK - Not able to decide about the statement.
D - Disagree with the statement
SD - Strongly disagree with the statement.

There is no right or wrong answer, therefore answer each question as you feel is appropriate to yourself.

1. My classmates make fun of me. SA A NK D SD
2. I am a happy person. SA A NK D SD
3. It is hard for me to make friends. SA A NK D SD
4. I am often sad. SA A NK D SD
5. I am smart. SA A NK D SD
6. I am shy. SA A NK D SD
7. I get nervous when the teacher calls on me. SA A NK D SD
8. My looks bother me. SA A NK D SD
9. When I grow up, I will be an important person. SA A NK D SD
10. I get worried when we have tests in school. SA A NK D SD
11. I am unpopular. SA A NK D SD
12. I am well behaved in school. SA A NK D SD
13. It is usually my fault when something goes wrong. SA A NK D SD
14. I cause trouble to my family. SA A NK D SD
15. I am strong. SA A NK D SD
16. I have good ideas SA A NK D SD
17. I am an important member of the family. SA A NK D SD
18. I usually want things my own way. SA A NK D SD
19. I am good at making things with my hands. SA A NK D SD
20. I give up easily. SA A NK D SD
21. I am good in my school work. SA A NK D SD
22. I do bad things. SA A NK D SD
23. I can draw well. SA A NK D SD
24. I am good at music. SA A NK D SD
25. I behave badly at home. SA A NK D SD
26. I am slow in finishing my school work. SA A NK D SD
27. I am an important member of my class. SA A NK D SD
28. I am nervous. SA A NK D SD

PART A

29. I have pretty eyes SA A NK D SD
30. I can give a good report in front of the class SA A NK D SD
31. In school, I am a dreamer. SA A NK D SD
32. I pick on my brother(s) and sister(s) SA A NK D SD
33. My friends like my ideas SA A NK D SD
34. I often get into trouble SA A NK D SD
35. I am obedient at home SA A NK D SD
36. I am lucky SA A NK D SD
37. I worry a lot SA A NK D SD
38. My parents expect too much of me SA A NK D SD
39. I like being the way I am SA A NK D SD
40. I feel left out of things SA A NK D SD
41. I have spent a lot of time thinking about who I am and what I can do SA A NK D SD
42. When I run into a new challenge, I know myself well enough to know if I can do it SA A NK D SD
43. I feel a person is better off when he takes responsibility for himself SA A NK D SD
44. I need somebody else to push me through on most things SA A NK D SD
45. I am really confident when I am doing something I know how to do SA A NK D SD

SELF ESTEEM PART B

SA - Strongly agree with the statement.
A - Agree with the statement.
NK - Not able to decide about the statement.
D - Disagree with the statement.
SD - Strongly disagree with the statement.

There is no right or wrong answer, therefore answer each question as you feel is appropriate to yourself.

1. I have nice hair. SA A NK D SD
2. I often volunteer at school. SA A NK D SD
3. I wish I were different. SA A NK D SD
4. I sleep well at night. SA A NK D SD
5. I hate school. SA A NK D SD
6. I am among the last to be chosen for games. SA A NK D SD
7. I am sick a lot. SA A NK D SD
8. I am often mean to other people. SA A NK D SD
9. My classmates in school think I have good ideas. SA A NK D SD
10. I am a happy guy. SA A NK D SD
11. I have many friends SA A NK D SD
12. I am cheerful all the time. SA A NK D SD
13. I am dumb about a lot of things. SA A NK D SD
14. I am good looking. SA A NK D SD
15. I have a lot of energy. SA A NK D SD
16. I get into a lot of fights SA A NK D SD
17. I am popular with other boys my age SA A NK D SD
18. People pick on me. SA A NK D SD
19. My family is disappointed in me. SA A NK D SD
20. I have a pleasant face. SA A NK D SD
21. Whenever I try to do something, everything seems to go wrong. SA A NK D SD
22. I am picked on at home. SA A NK D SD
23. I am leader in games and sports. SA A NK D SD
24. I am clumsy. SA A NK D SD

PART B

25. In games and sports, I would rather watch than play. SA A NK D SD
26. I forget what I learn. SA A NK D SD
27. I am easy to get along with. SA A NK D SD
28. I loose my temper easily. SA A NK D SD
29. I am popular with the girls. SA A NK D SD
30. I am a good reader. SA A NK D SD
31. I would rather work alone than be with a group. SA A NK D SD
32. I like my brother (sister). SA A NK D SD
33. I think I have a good body. SA A NK D SD
34. I am often afraid. SA A NK D SD
35. I am always breaking or dropping things. SA A NK D SD
36. I can be trusted. SA A NK D SD
37. I am different from other people. SA A NK D SD
38. I think bad thoughts a lot. SA A NK D SD
39. I cry easily. SA A NK D SD
40. I am a good person. SA A NK D SD
41. Most of my feelings and motives are a mystery to me. SA A NK D SD
42. If I had to, I could list most of my weaknesses and strengths. SA A NK D SD
43. I feel confident that I can handle the problems that arise in the future. SA A NK D SD
44. I believe that what happens to me is my own fault. SA A NK D SD
45. I let other people decide what to do. SA A NK D SD

240

APPENDIX F

Student Rating Form (Program A.C.T.I.O.N.)

PROGRAM A.C.T.I.O.N.

STUDENT RATING FORM

NAME: GROUP:

	RATING						RATING						RATING				
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
1. EFFORT - Willing to learn - Cooperate, punctual - Energetic, curious - Persistent, considerate																	
2. MATURITY - Easy going (about challenge) - Modest, steady, honest																	
3. LEADERSHIP - Good mixer, cheerful - Talkative																	
4. COMPETENCE - Self-sufficient, creative - Good self-confidence																	
5. PHYSICAL ABILITY - Good athletic skills - Good physical strength																	
6. STAFF RELATIONSHIP - 'sucks up', handles authority well - Staff's general feelings toward youth																	
7. INITIATIVE - Willing to start on his own - Shows high level of participation when initiates																	
8. ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS - trees, plants, ecological awareness																	
9. DETERMINATION - motivation to succeed																	
10. PEER RELATIONSHIPS - handles authority - communication with other students, fits in well																	

CAMP A.C.T.I.O.N.

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM - FINAL

NAME: ______________________ GROUP: ______________

DATE: ______________________

	RATING					STAFF OBSERVATIONS
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. EFFORT						
2. MATURITY						
3. LEADERSHIP						
4. COMPETENCE						
5. PHYSICAL ABILITY						
6. STAFF RELATIONSHIP						
7. INITIATIVE						
8. ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS						
9. DETERMINATION						
10. PEER RELATIONSHIPS						

OVERALL EVALUATION

GOALS ACHIEVED:

PROGRESS BETWEEN FIRST AND LAST DAY:

STRENGTHS:

WEAKNESSES:

RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE GOALS AND LEARNING:

VALUE FOR FUTURE GROUP PARTICIPATION:

CONCLUSION:

Signature

Date

APPENDIX G

A.C.T.I.O.N. 1979 Activity Outlines

1. Wall Climb	This consists of a fourteen foot wooden wall over which all ten participants must scale as a group on their initial arrival at project D.A.R.E. They compete against time so that their final attempt on graduation day can be compared. This task will demonstrate initiative, cooperation, decision-making and leadership.
2. Welcome Walk	The welcome walk is an introduction and orientation of new participants to the principles of the A.C.T.I.O.N. program. It is meant to be a quick and effective experimental exercise to set the tone for the entire program as well as the appreciation of the equipment that they will be using. The walk is conducted on the first night at camp, and is meant to be a surprise in that the boys are not aware it is going to happen. The objective is to expose the youth to immediate peer interaction, offer an opportunity for an initial instructure assessment, introduce the students to dealing with stress, and to introduce the students to dealing with stress, and to introduce the concept of debriefing. On the overnight outing all that is taken is some toilet paper, 5 cups, 2 tarps, 5 blankets for staff and students, a limited amount of snacks are also brought. Upon arrival at the destination the staff then inform the students that they are staying overnight and begin to explain the purpose of the experience.
3. Obstacle Course	This is comprised of approximately 15-20 man made obstacles over a lengthy course. The obstacle course is to be achieved by the students on a group effort basis and will demonstrate coordination, strength, persistence, and agility.
4. Canoeing Skills	Instructions are given in the various areas of canoeing in order to prepare for the canoe trip. Instructions involve and paddle, paddling strokes, rescue techniques, beaching procedures, portaging-single and double. Lifejackets are manditory at all times and all boys must complete a swim screen test before entering a canoe.

5. Wilderness Canoe Tripping	Each program had one canoe expedition that was six days in duration. The trips took place in Algonquin Park and Tamagami Lakes region. The crews travelled approximately 100-160 miles, depending on terrain. Each trip also included approximately ten miles of portaging, ranging from 100 yards to three miles in length. Throughout the trips lessons were given in geography, ecology, weather predicting techniques, plant studies, and life skills. The days started at six and usually ended at dusk. The key objectives were to introduce the boys to hard and challenging tasks, cooperation, leadership, application of practical skills, as well as a true sense of adventure and responsibility.
6. Low Organizational Games	These games were held during relaxed moments, such as, during the evening after the days events were done. Some of the games included tag, flags, soccer, push ball, group wrestling, etc. The objective was to offer alternatives from laying about and to provide the boys with some time to have their own structured fun for their hard work. Therefore, the games were dependent on the day's events being completed in time.
7. Duet	The duet is conducted during the canoe trip and is used as the initial introduction of the student to being alone in the wilderness. Every attempt is made by the staff to pair two boys who are having difficulties communicating, or one is doing well and the other not. The objective is to offer the boys an opportunity to get along, prepare them for the solo, follow simple rules of staying put, no loud noises and to practice outdoor skills.
8. Lone Watch	The lone watch is a further preparation in dealing with the outdoors on an individual basis. It is done just before the actual solo. It is classified as a mini-solo in that the student spends the night alone in the bush and is discouraged from sleeping by keeping a small fire going all night. He is also encouraged to reflect on what has been done and what he has learned so far in the prgram. Staff make several checks throughout the night to wake any of those who might fall asleep. On one of the rounds the staff talks to each boy for a period of time about how they are doing, any problems etc. In order to make the experience challenging the staff psych-up the boys several days ahead of time.

9. Solo	The solo experience is a three day activity which involves the student being placed alone on an island in Georgian Bay. The solo is not designed to be an ordeal but is intended to teach one how to conquer nature and confront oneself. For many it is the most challenging and difficult task. The time is meant to be spent in introspection and meditation. The experience is said to be akin to the initiation rites of primitive tribes (Kelly and Baer, 1968). For most, it will be the first opportunity that they have been alone without any form of physical or mental distractions or guidance, in order that they might come to grips with their own feelings. Students are provided with a solo kit and equipment and will be required to construct their own shelters and combine all their lessons over the past two weeks. Regular check-ups are made. For those on an honours solo no food for three days, no talking with staff is permitted. The honours solo is left up to the student's discretion, but almost all boys start out trying.
10. Flying Fox	The flying fox is the first activity in which the youth is able to prepare for his adventure with heights. The student is required to glide along a cable from a tower to the middle of the lake. Also, the students will be involved in climbing ropes, a net and a mock climbing wall at the site, all meant to introduce the boys to heights, climbing, rapelling and trust. Each probationer takes turn guiding his peers up and down the wall as well as assisting each other in putting on the safety gear.
11. Aerial Course	This consist of a series of eight adventurous activities which involve individual challenge and a fear of the unknown. The obstacles average 50 ft. in height and are located in the upper part of trees and involve controlled risk and fear. In this activity, the student is fitted in a safety device but the element of risk and falling are still present. The main objective is to offer individual adventure and group participation in helping others overcome some of the more difficult obstacles.

12. Rock Climbing, Rappelling and Rescue	The debrief to the activity is important. The general philosophy is discussed, i.e. Incas used it for exhilaration, self-confidence, and recognizing personal limitations. It is a technical activity which introduces the student to basic climbing, rapelling and rescue techniques. The objectives include high adventure, cooperation, listening, leadership, physical skills, team work and trust in ones peers. Technically it is the most challenging activity of the program. A special mountaineering staff is used to assist in teaching the skills.
13. Orienteering	This involves training sessions where students are taught the various aspects of compass work, map reading and topography. Objectives are to teach the students how to find their way in the wilderness, develop trust in skills, and an awareness for some of the essential tools for survival in the woods. The sessions are structured so that there is a gradual introduction to using the compass. The final challenge consists of the group taking turns leading the group through the bush to a designated point and back via a different route.
14. Low Initiative Course	This is an obstacle course which deals specifically with agility and group support. Obstacles include the balance walk, tunnel crawl, tire climbing, and a number of other agility tasks.
15. Kayaking	This is a ballistic individualized sport which requires specialized knowledge of the craft and its capabilities and potential. It is meant as a diversion from canoeing; low key recreation and some degree of cooperation as members must help each other if they capsize.
16. Wide Games	These are initiative tasks which challenge the physical and mental abilities of the participants. They also require the joint efforts of all members of the group if the task is to be completed. Wide games are helpful in developing a participant's awareness of the decision-making process, the roles involving leadership versus followership and the obligation of each and every member of a group confronted with a problem. The initiative tasks reflect the ability to combine learning with fun. Some of the games include: electric fence (rope and pole, everyone over), monster walk (ten feet and ten hands on the ground), blind tent erection, and charades.

17. Morning Run and Dip	The run is approximately two to three miles in length and takes place immediately after arising in the morning at 6 a.m. and a light warm-up. Upon completion of the run the entire crew jumps into the lake. The objective of the exercise is to condition the boys, for the marathon, and it allows the crew leader and rest of the group to work together to complete the run. The staff set the pace and it is then the crews responsibility to keep together to avoid a longer run.
18. Marathon Run	This occurs at the end of the program and involves a five mile endurance run against time. It is an individual race through which each runner can exert his utmost effort. A one hour time limit is set, if a runner does not finish within the allotted time they would have to rerun the distance later in the afternoon.
19. Debriefing	These group discussion sessions are held after every major activity and are meant to deal with how the students have coped with particular situations. It serves as a learning experinece as the boys reflect on their emotional and physical reactions to the activity. The session also serves as a group counselling and "gripe" session. The "gripe" segment allows each individual to vent any emotional feelings he may have toward another person. (It usually only takes two or three such settings before everyone is putting in a sincere effort to attain something from the opportunity).
20. Hike	The hike involves a strenuous 22 mile walk through a rugged terrain in Algonquin Park. The staff set the pace for the first half of the walk while it is the crews' responsibility to keep together if they are to have their scheduled ten minute rest break every 50 minutes. On the last third of the walk the crew is given the responsibility to complete the remaining walk in a designated time period in order to earn a store stop on the way home. The walk relies on the determination and endurance of the probationers. The objectives include both physical and mental stress on the individual and the crew as a whole. The walk presents a situation which necessitates cooperation, discipline, and patience. (The exhileration of success was often expressed by the boys running the final half mile and yelling out their pride for all to hear).

21. Tuck	This is an earned group activity into town. Students run equal distances (one mile each) towards town to spend their money. The objective is to visit the local community and briefly interact in a positive manner. It also permits a child to buy a treat after he has earned it. The exercise also serves to create a "family" feeling as the crew encourage each other on. Each boy must complete his mile in less than eight minutes. Tuck run occurs during the evening and is accompanied by at least two staff who also run.
22. Graduation Supper Ceremonies and Regatta.	On the final full day after the marathon a series of activities are organized to offer the boys a sense of accomplishment. The wall is redone, there are canoe races, swimming relay games, orienteering activities, and other low key but enjoyable activities organized in a compact manner so as to maximize the time and variety of skills learned throughout their stay. Dinner is held in the kitchen under a semi-formal setting. After supper the awards ceremony is held. The ceremonies involve passing out level one and two canoe badges, a basic first aid certificate, and an A.C.T.I.O.N. t-shirt if the probationer has successfully completed the program according to the staff's criteria. **All the participants are spoken to on an individual basis after the ceremonies for any final comments and questions they might have.

**Unlike other programs the symbol for recognition of completing the course was presented to all boys as long as they showed some sign of improvement. If the staff felt the boy had obviously put in less effort than the rest it was mentioned during the ceremony so that the others could still feel proud. It was decided, by the staff, that to not graduate someone might have more negative consquences than graduating him and letting it be known that if he is going to make the experience work he is going to have to apply himself very hard.

APPENDIX H

Program A.C.T.I.O.N. 1978:
Ten Day Sample Schedule

Program A.C.T.I.O.N. 1978: Ten Day Sample Schedule Appendix H

Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 4	Day 5
- Travel to D.A.R.E. from Kitchener (4 hrs) - Orientation tour and wall climb - Swim test - Dinner at camp - Equipment issue - Set up base camp - Canoe skills - Visit project office for D.A.R.E. films - Return to base camp, snack - Lights out (22.00)	0600 Rise & shine - Run and dip - Breakfast - Obstacle course - Lunch - Resume activities at obstacle course/ pole climb - Recreational swim(?) - Base camp supper - Canoe skills - Trip preparation - Campfire snacks - Staff evaluation	0600 Rise & shine - Breakfast - Depart for Algonquin Park for 3-day wilderness canoe expedition approx. 40-70 mls. (depending on route 5-6 mls of portaging). - Evening wide games	0600 Rise & shine - Breakfast - Clean-up (no trace camping) - Evening begin solo discussions - Debrief - Games - Staff evaluation	0600 Rise & shine - Breakfast - Clean-up - Return to pick-up - points for mid-afternoon - Supper at Project D.A.R.E. kitchen - Evening/debrief map & compass orienteering - Early lights out
		- trip wild edibles and basic ecology are taught		
Day 6	**Day 7**	**Day 8**	**Day 9**	**Day 10**
- 0600 Rise & shine - Run and dip - Breakfast - Aerial course 55' high - Debrief - Evening climbing preparation - Night compass hike	0600 Rise & shine - Run and dip - Breakfast - Travel to O.V. cabin for climbing and rapelling - Debrief - Evening wide games - solo preparation snack - Staff evaluation	0600 Rise & shine - Run and dip - Breakfast - 9.30 depart for solo sites around Beautiful Lake *Staff located at strategic observation point to see and hear most individuals. 3-4 visits throughout the day and night.	0600 Rise & shine - 9.30 return to O.U. cabin - Solo debrief - Return main camp - Lunch kitchen - Kayaking - Evening wide games - Final student review	0600 Rise & shine - 4 mile marathon run - Breakfast - Informal graduation - Return equipment - Depart for home

*see appendix B for general description of activities

APPENDIX I

Program A.C.T.I.O.N. 1979:
Twenty-one day Sample Schedule

x59

PROGRAM A.C.T.I.O.N. 1979:

21 days sample schedule

1. - arrived at D.A.R.E. - orientation - wall climb - swim screen - canoe skills - welcome walk	2. - return base camp - run and dip - canoe skills - flying fix - canoe skills - wide games	3. - run and dip - canoe skills - first aid - water orientation with canoes - debrief - trip prep	4. life skills discussion	5. wild edibles education	6. wide games	7. duet
8. debrief duet wide games	9. return to base camp - debrief trip - showers relax	10. - knots & lashing - aerial course - obstacle course - early night	11. 22 mile hike/ Western Uplands Algonguin Park	12. - Outward Venture cabin - rapelling & climbing - wide games	13. - mountain rescue techn. and practice - lone watch	14. - debrief - return base camp - kayaking - tuck run - solo prep.
15. - travel to Georgian Bay - solo discussion safety, procedure questions etc.	16.	17. solo Georgian Bay Islands	18.	19. - pick-up - debrief - return to base camp - dinner in project kitchen - sauna - low key activities	20. - 5 mile marathon run - grad activities and results (see appendix) - return equip. - complete post camp tests - grad. supper & ceremony - individual discussion with student.	21. - depart for Kitchener

APPENDIX J

Post-Camp Interview - Questionnaire Sheet for the Student

INTERVIEW - QUESTIONNAIRE SHEET
FOR THE STUDENT - POST CAMP

General Information

Who are your two very best friends? ________________ ________________

Do you like school? No ___ Yes ___

What grade are you in? __________

Do you want to go to high school? No ___ Yes ___

Do you think you would like to go to college or university? No ___ Yes ___

What kind of job would you like? ______________________________

How do you get along with your teachers? Very well ___ OK ___ Not so well ___

How do you get along with your parents?

Father - Very well ___ OK ___ Not so well ___

Mother - Very well ___ OK ___ Not so well ___

Have your best friends (re.Q.1) been in trouble too? No ___ Yes ___ If so, in what way? ____

Why do you think you are here? ____

Do you think your father expected you to get into trouble? No ___ Yes ___

Do you think your mother expected you to get into trouble? No ___ Yes ___

Does your father work? No ___ Yes ___ Where and what does he do? __________

____

Does your mother work? No ___ Yes ___ Where and what does she do? __________

____

How many other brothers and sisters do you have (age, sex, grade) __________

____

Has anyone else in your family ever appeared in court before? No___ Yes ___

Do you know what for ___ how many times ___ (Describe the offences and how many times) ____

____

____

NOW THAT YOU HAVE BEEN AT PROGRAM A.C.T.I.O.N.

YES	NO	
___	___	1. Do you think you got a "bum rap" by coming here?
___	___	2. If you keep out of trouble will it be becaue of what you learned here?
___	___	3. Do you like yourself better now than when you first came to A.C.T.I.O.N.
___	___	4. Would you like to come back to A.C.T.I.O.N. later for a reunion and to just have a good time?
___	___	5. Do you think you learned more bad things during your stay at A.C.T.I.O.N. than if you had stayed at home?
___	___	6. Was the work fair while you were here?
___	___	7. Did you volunteer? Do your share while you were here?
___	___	8. Did any of the staff ride you too hard at action?
___	___	9. Did any of the staff make it easy for you at times? _Give an example:____________________
___	___	10. Did any of the other guys pick on you while you were here? examples: ____________________
___	___	11. If you could be one of the staff would you run things the same way?
___	___	12. Have you ever committed an offence?
___	___	13. Do you think the offence you committed was serious?
___	___	14. If a guy can get along here can he get along on the "outside"?
___	___	15. Do you think you are stronger and healthier now that you have been here?
___	___	16. Do you think you can get along better with people now?
___	___	17. Did you break any rules while at A.C.T.I.O.N? What over? ____________________
___	___	18. Were you given a fair chance to make good before you came here?
___	___	19. Would you say that the staff at A.C.T.I.O.N. were of any help to you?
___	___	20. Do you think you are tough?
___	___	21. Will you try to keep secret the fact that you have been at A.C.T.I.O.N?
___	___	22. Will you be proud to have been here?
___	___	23. Will you ever want to wear your T-shirt?
___	___	24. If a friend of yours got into trouble, would you want him to come here?

page two of four

YES NO

___ ___ 25. Most of the guys are interested in just getting by while they are here?

___ ___ 26. The idea of taking turns cooking and washing dishes is good?

___ ___ 27. Do you think coming to action is a good way for paying for the things that you did wrong?

___ ___ 28. Do you think you should have to pay for the things you do wrong?

What does A.C.T.I.O.N. stand for?______________________________

Now that you are leaving A.C.T.I.O.N. do you feel:

YES NO

___ ___ Bitter

___ ___ About the same as always

___ ___ Friendly

___ ___ Hopeful about staying out of trouble

___ ___ Relaxed

___ ___ Ready to make a fresh start

___ ___ Pissed off

Did any of the following help you while you were at A.C.T.I.O.N.:

YES NO

___ ___ Being left alone

___ ___ Being told what to do

___ ___ The staff helping you

___ ___ The climbing and rapelling

___ ___ The canoe trip

___ ___ Being pushed hard

___ ___ The aerial course

___ ___ Nothing helped me while I was here

___ ___ The solos

Regardless of what they say, the best way to get along here is to:

YES NO

___ ___ Play it cool
___ ___ Stay out of the way of the Staff
___ ___ Try to figure yourslef out
___ ___ Try to do your best
___ ___ Keep your mouth shut
___ ___ Make friends with the staff
___ ___ Make friends with the other boys
___ ___ Talk about yourself to the staff

APPENDIX K

Probation Officers' Response Inventory Form

FAMILY CRIMINALITY

To your knowledge, was there any evidence that the father or father-figure had a criminal or delinquency record?

Yes............1
No.............2
Don't know.....3

To your knowledge, was there any evidence that the mother or mother-figure had a criminal or delinquency record?

Yes............1
No.............2
Don't know.....3

To your knowledge, was there any evidence that the brothers or sisters (including step-brothers or step-sisters if a common-law or remarriage situation exists) of the client have criminal or delinquency records?

Yes............1
No.............2
Don't know.....3
Not applicable.4

SCHOOL PROBLEMS

Has the client been an attendance problem in school?

Yes............1
No.............2
Don't know.....3

Has the client had any significant motivational difficulties in school?

Yes............1
No.............2
Don't know.....3

Has the client been a significant discipline problem in school?

Yes............1
No.............2
Don't know.....3

Has the client had any diagnosed learning difficulties?

Yes............1
No.............2
Don't know.....3

MEASURE OF FAMILY STABILITY

While the client was being raised, did any of the following events occur:

Client taken from parents:
Yes............1
No.............2
Don't know.....3

Client adopted:
Yes............1
No.............2
Don't know.....3

Either one or both parents died:
Yes............1
No.............2
Don't know.....3

Parents divorced or separated:
Yes............1
No.............2
Don't know.....3

Remarriage or new common-law union, of parents:
Yes............1
No.............2
Don't know.....3

Parents separated intermittently:
Yes............1
No.............2
Don't know.....3

Prolonged absence of a parent:
Yes............1
No.............2
Don't know.....3

FAMILY FEELINGS

With respect to his or her feelings toward the father or father-figure, is the client usually:

Attached...............................1
Indifferent............................2
Inconsistent...........................3
Hostile................................4
Don't know.............................5

With respect to his or her feelings toward the mother or mother-figure, is the client usually:

Attached...............................1
Indifferent............................2
Inconsistent...........................3
Hostile................................4
Don't know.............................5

Instructions: Circle the appropriate answer for each of the following six categories.

STATUS OF NEIGHBOURHOOD IN WHICH THE CLIENT LIVES

Upper Class	1
Upper-Middle Class	2
Lower-Middle Class	3
Lower Class	4
Lower-Lower Class	5

YEARLY HOUSEHOLD INCOME AT PROBATION TERMINATION

$8,000 or Less	1
$8,001 to $15,000	2
$15,001 to $25,000	3
$25,001 or Over	4
Can't Even Guess	5
Not Applicable	6

RELIANCE ON SOCIAL ASSISTANCE INCOME BY CLIENT'S FAMILY

Frequent Use	1
Infrequent	2
Don't know	3

LIVING COMPANIONS AT THE TIME OF THE PROBATION ORDER

Both parents	1
Mother only	2
Father only	3
Mother and other Male	4
Father and other Female	5
Foster home	6
Institute or Group Home	7
Relatives or Friends	8
Common-law, Married	9

COHESIVENESS OF THE CLIENT'S FAMILY

Very cohesive	1
Somewhat Cohesive	2
Not Cohesive	3
Don't know	4

RELATIONSHIPS WITH PARENTS

Attached	1
Indifferent	2
Inconsistent	3
Hostile	4
Don't Know	5

NUMBER OF DISPOSITIONS BY TYPE OF DELINQUENCY

Type of Delinquency	Aware of No Dispositions	One	Two	Three or More
Delinquencies Against the Person				
Delinquencies Against Property				
Delinquencies Against Public Morals and Decency				
Delinquencies Against Public Order and Peace				
Liquor Offences				
Traffic Offences				
Status Offences				

Instructions: Circle the appropriate answer for each of the following three categories.

PERIOD OF TIME FOR WHICH PROBATION ORDER WAS MADE

6 Months or Less............1
7 to 12 Months..............2
13 to 18 Months.............3
19 to 24 Months.............4
Over 24 Months..............5
Indefinite..................6

ACTUAL TIME SPENT ON PROBATION TO TERMINATION OF THE ORDER

6 Months or Less................1
7 to 12 Months..................2
13 to 18 Months.................3
19 to 24 Months.................4
Over 24 Months..................5

AMOUNT OF SUPERVISION REQUIRED BY CLIENT

Intensive Supervision.......1
Medium Supervision..........2
Minimal Supervision.........3
No Supervision Required.....4

Instructions: Circle the appropriate answer for each of the following four categories.

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF PARENT DURING PROBATION

Employment Status	Father	Mother
Employed		
In and Out of Work		
Unemployed, but Looking for Work		
Unemployed, and not Looking for Work		
Not Applicable/Don't Know		

USUAL OCCUPATION OF PARENTS

Occupation	Father	Mother
Professional, Technical		
Managers, Officials and Proprietors		
Technical/Administrative Clerical		
Clerical/Filing		
Sales		
Craftsmen, Foremn		
Operatives		
Service		
Labourers		
Private Household		
Homemaker		
Not Applicable		
Don't Know		

FREQUENCY OF SCHOOL TRANSFERS

Frequently	1
Occasionally	2
Rarely	3
Never	4

AGE AT FIRST RECORDED EVIDENCE OF DIFFICULTY WITH THE LAW

Under 11	1
12 or 13	2
14 or 15	3
16 or 17	4

MAGNITUDE OF PROBLEMS

The following items are often identified by Probation Officers as common "problem areas" for their clients. At the time the Probation Order on this client was terminated, how would you summarize this client's progress, or deterioration, during the probation period in each of these areas? (Please write one number in the answer bod for each problem area.)

	Some Improvement	No Consistent Trend Or Change	Some Deterioration	Not a Problem	Don't Know
Relationship with friends					
Relationship with parents					
Relationship with co-workers					
Relationship with friends of opposite sex					
Relationship with authority figures					
Use of leisure time					
Acceptable living quarters					
Progress in employment					
Progress in school work					
Drug/alcohol use					
Self-confidence					
Control of hostility					
Avoiding new crimes					

For this particular client, how important were each of the following areas in influencing your perceptions as to the relative success or failure of this individual during the probation period?

	Very Important	Fairly Important	Not Important	Not Applicable/ Irrelevant
Relationship with friends				
Relationship with parents				
Relationship with co-workders				
Relationship with friends of opposite sex				
Relationship with authority figures				
Use of leisure time				
Acceptable living quarters				
Progress in employment				
Progress in school work				
Drug/alcohol use				
Self-confidence				
Control of hostility				
Avoiding new crimes				
A.C.T.I.O.N.				

Instructions: Circle the appropriate answer for each of the following four categories.

SOCIAL AGENCIES INVOLVED WITH THE CLIENT DURING PROBATION

Children's Aid Society.........1
Clinic (e.g., Psychological Assessment)...........2
Hospital (e.g., Physical Illnesses)..................3
Residential Treatment Centre (e.g. Emotional Disturbance Problem)........4
Family Service Association.......................5

REMOVALS FROM THE HOME DURING THE PROBATION PERIOD

Group Home..................1
Foster Home.................2
Relative's Home.............3
Treatment Centre............4
Institution.................5
Not Applicable..............6

NUMBER OF CHARGES LAID DURING PROBATION PERIOD

No Charges Laid...............1
One Charge....................2
Two or Three Charges..........3
Four or More Charges..........4
Don't Know....................5

PROBATION OFFICER'S EVALUATION OF CLIENT'S PROBATION SUCCESS

Unqualified Success..........1
Qualified Success............2
Neither Success or Failure...3
Successful Start, Followed by Deterioration..........4
Clear and Definite Failure...5

Name of Client:...

Comments:...

....

....

....

....

Thank you for your co-operation

APPENDIX L

Student Follow-up Survey

This short survey is meant to help us see how you've been doing since the summer.

Please circle the number you feel is correct.

1. a) Are you in school now?
yes - 1
no - 2
was, but quit - 3

b) If yes, what grade? ________

2. Are you working now?
yes - 1
no - 2
was, but quit - 3

3. If you are in school, how are you doing?

very good (A's) - 1
O.K. (passing) - 2
not too bad (passing most) - 3
poorly (failing) - 4

4. If you are working, what are you doing? ______________________________

____

5. Do you think that probation has helped you keep out of trouble?

yes (a lot) - 1
some - 2
very little - 3
not at all - 4

6. If you went to A.C.T.I.O.N., do you think it has helped you...

a) stay out of troble
yes (a lot) - 1
some - 2
very little - 3
not at all - 4

b) get along with others better

yes (a lot) - 1
some - 2
very little - 3
not at all - 4

c) help yourself, for example--feeling better about yourself.

yes (a lot) - 1
some - 2
very little - 3
not at all - 4

7. Do you still have some of the same friends as last summer?

yes - 1
no - 2

8. If you went to A.C.T.I.O.N., have you seen any of the other boys?

yes - 1
no - 2
don't know - 3

9. What do you like to do with your free time? ______________________

____

10. Have any of your friends gotten into trouble with the police since the summer?

yes - 1
no - 2
don't know - 3

11. Have you had any contact with the police (i.e., picked up, or stopped by?)

yes - 1
no - 2
don't know - 3

12. If yes, how many times? ______________________

13. If yes, what did you do? ______________________

14. If yes, were any charges laid? yes - 1
no - 2

15. If yes, were you found guilty? yes - 1
no - 2

16. If found guilty, what were you required to do? ______________________

____

17. How do you get along with your parents?

a) Father -- Very well_____ O.K. _____ Not so well_____

b) Mother -- Very well_____ O.K. _____ Not so well_____

Thank you for filling out this form.

APPENDIX M

Parent/Guradian Follow-up Survey with Covering Letter

FROM:Ministry of Community and Social Services - ACTION PROGRAM

January 2, 1980

Dear Parent(s):

Last summer ________________________was involved in the A.C.T.I.O.N. course evaluation by either attending the camp near South River or by participating in the program of probation supervision. As part of our attempt to determine the usefulness of these programs, the boys completed written questionnaires which expressed their feelings about their experiences in the program in which they participated. We would now like to ask you, as the parent(s), or guardian(s) of ____________________, what your feelings are about the program, and whether or not it was useful. The information you provide will be very important in whether the planning of future programs should be made. Therefore, we would appreciate you taking several minutes to complete the following survey.

The information that you provide is strictly confidential. Neither your name, your boy's or anyone you might mention will appear anywhere in the final report. No part of the survey will ever be available to anyone other than the researcher, John Winterdyk.

Please note, there are no right or wrong answers. Answer all the questions as well as you can. It is important you answer all the questions.

The questionnaire should take about fifteen minutes to complete. After you have completed the survey, please return it in the prepaid envelope provided you, as soon as possible.

Thank you for your participation. If you are interested in the final results, please add a separate piece of paper with your name and address, or mail it separately, and the general findings will be forwarded to you in the near future.

/.....

If you have any questions about the survey, you can contact myself, John Winterdyk, or Mr. Rick Mazur, at the Kitchener probation office from January 3 - 15; telephone 744-6571.

Sincerely,

(signed) John Winterdyk
John Winterdyk
A.C.T.I.O.N. Co-ordinator
and Researcher

(signed) Rick Mazur
Rick Mazur
Probation Officer
A.C.T.I.O.N. Co-ordinator.

LIFE DOMAIN SURVEY

Instructions: Please circle the correct number for each question.

1. This form is being completed by the:

father - 1
mother - 2
guardian - 3
other (please specify) - 4

2. Educational level of mother; please circle the last level completed:

public school - 1
not finish public school - 2
high school - 3
not finish high school - 4
post-secondary school - 5
not finish post-secondary school - 6
not applicable - 7

3. Employment status of the mother:

employed - 1
in and out of work - 2
unemployed but looking for work - 3
unemployed but not looking for work - 4
don't know/not applicable - 5

4. If the mother is working, what does she do? (Please specify):________

____

5. If the mother is not working, has she ever worked before?

yes, full-time - 1
never - 2
part-time - 3

6. How would the mother describe her relationship with her son?

1..........2..........3..........4..........5
attached/ very good — indifferent — very poor/ hostile most of the time

7. Did the mother expect her son to get into trouble with the law?

yes, most certainly - 1
no, not at all - 2
uncertain - 3

8. Has the mother ever committed a criminal or delinquent act and been charged for it?

yes - 1
no - 2

9. Educational level of father; please circle the last level completed:

public school - 1
not finish public school - 2
high school - 3
not finish high school - 4
post secondary school - 5
not finish post secondary school - 6
not applicable - 7

10. Employment status of the father:

employed - 1
in and out of work - 2
unemployed but looking for work - 3
unemployed but not looking for work - 4
don't know/not applicable - 5

11. If the father is working, what does he do? (Please specify):________

____

12. If the father is not working, has he ever worked before?

yes, full-time - 1
never - 2
part-time - 3

13. How would the father describe his relationship with his son ?

1..........2..........3..........4..........5
attached/ very good — indifferent — very poor/hostile most of the time.

14. Did the father expect his son to get into trouble with the law?

yes, most certainly - 1
no, not at all - 2
uncertain - 3

15. Has the father ever committed a criminal or delinquent act and been charged for it?

yes - 1
no - 2

16. What are the ages and sex of any other children in the family?________

____

17. Does your son attend school?

yes - 1
no - 2

18. If yes, has he been an attendance problem at school?

yes - 1
no - 2
don't know - 3

19. If yes, how well has he been doing this year?

very well (A's) - 1
good (A's-B's some C's) - 2
fair (C's-D's) - 3
poorly (failing some courses) - 4

20. If yes, what grade is he in?____________________

What school does he attend? ____

21. If no, does he work?

full-time - 1
part-time - 2
not at all - 3

22. What job does he have?____

23. Do you feel your son's attitude has improved after being on probation supervision?

1	2	3	4	5	6
improved a lot		some change		attitude not changed	nothing wrong with attitude before

24. Do you feel your son's behaviour has improved after being on probation supervision?

1	2	3	4	5	6
improved a lot		some change		attitude not changed	nothing wrong with attitude before

25. If your son attended program A.C.T.I.O.N., do you feel that his attitudes have improved since returning from camp?

improved a lot - 1
improved somewhat - 2
improved for a while - 3
not improved, got little worse - 4
attitude not changed - 5
nothing wrong with attitude before - 6

26. If your sone attended program A.C.T.I.O.N., do you feel that his behaviour has improved since returning from camp?

improved a lot - 1
improved somewhat - 2
improved for a while - 3
not improved, got little worse - 4
attitude not changed - 5
nothing wrong with attitude before - 6

27. Why do you think he got into trouble with the law?____________________

____

____

28. Has he been in any trouble with the law since last summer?

yes - 1
no - 2
don't know - 3

29. The following items are designed to assess how your son has been doing since the summer; please circle the correct number for each question.

some improvement - 1
no consistent trend or change - 2
some deterioration - 3
not a problem - 4
don't know - 5

Relationship with friends	1	2	3	4	5
Relationship with parents	1	2	3	4	5
Relationship with coworkers/ fellow students	1	2	3	4	5
Relationship with friends of opposite sex	1	2	3	4	5

Relationship with authority figures	1	2	3	4	5
Use of leisure time	1	2	3	4	5
Progress in school/ employment	1	2	3	4	5
Drug/alcohol use	1	2	3	4	5
Self-confidence	1	2	3	4	5
Control of hostility	1	2	3	4	5
Avoidance of new crimes	1	2	3	4	5

30. Would you like to add anything that you feel has been omitted in terms of how your son has reacted or not reacted since the summer? For example, do you feel the A.C.T.I.O.N. program should be continued for other youths; any suggestions on how to improve the programs, etc.

Thank you. Please return the form.

APPENDIX N

A.C.T.I.O.N. 1979 Program - Education Credit and Outline

A.C.T.I.O.N. 1979 PROGRAM

Education Credit and Outline

Introduction

The content of the program is such that it warrants the granting of a Level I or II Credit in Outdoor Education. This credit is to be granted by the child's high school principal as an out-of-school credit course.

The students will arrive and commence the program at the same time and follow the components as outlined. The program will be delivered by three staff members, who are under the guidance of a Chief Instructor and report to the Program Coordinator. The emphsis of the program is on outdoor skills, recreational carry-over, behaviour modification, and the acceptance of responsibility to oneself and others. The classroom is the out-of-doors and emphasis is placed upon the practical application of knowledge for maximum retention by this clientelle.

Course Outline

It is difficult to place a specific number of hours of instruction and practice on each activity as many topics will be interrelated, but the 21 day program comprises working days of at least ten hour/day for each student. All of these ten hours will be used for instruction and practical application of skills outlined in this course content. Our staffing model is set up so that three staff members instruct a group of ten boys or girls or the duration of their program (living with them day and night). Two staff members are always with the students.

The actual time of intimate involvement with the program far exceeds the minimum 120 hours required for a secondary school credit.

I. Hikes:

- outdoor classroom
- touching, listening, smelling, tasting
- natural scavenger hunts
- natural phenomenon
- keeping records of plant and animal life

35 hours approx.

- comparative charts - habitat, feeding habits, physical characteristics, prey, scats, tracks
- packing and theory of travel

II. Bushcraft:

- fire lighting
- wilderness cooking
- shelter construction
- emergency repairs to equipment
- search and rescue
- camp gadgets
- trip planning
- menu planning
- emergency signals
- first aid

25 hours approx.

- axemanship, tree falling, conservation, no trace camping
- knots and lashings
- care of equipment
- trapping and snaring
- fishing with improvised equipment

III. Orienteering:

- parts of a compass
- taking bearings and backbearings
- topographic maps: scale, symbols, taking a bearing from,

10 hours approx,

- point to point, score orienteering and canoe orienteering course
- navigation on trips

IV. Weather:

2 hours approx.

- cloud types
- prediction
- relevance

V. Ecology:

- comparative ecology: trips will be conducted in such diverse areas as Algonquin Park, French River, Bruce Trail, Georgian Bay, Magnetawan River, South River, Moosonee, thus allowing comparisons among various geographical areas of the Province.

VI. Plant Studies:

3 hours approx.

- identification and utilization by man and nature
- edible plants
- tree identification
- value of certain tree species to man

VII. Environmental Awareness:

5 hours approx.

- stream studies
- forestry topics
- no trace camping
- interrelationships among plant/animal/weather/man

VIII. Aerial Course & Pole Climb:

8 hours approx.

- safety procedures
- rescue techniques

IX. Obstacle Course:

8 hours approx.

- spotting and safety techniques
- repair
- construction

X. Jogging:

15 hours approx.

- a graduated running and fitness program occurs. Each morning the distance of the run is increased. The culmination is the Five Mile Marathon.

XI. Canoeing: - parts of canoe
- strokes
12 hours approx.
- portaging
- safety and rescue

XII. Rock Climbing & Rappelling:
- calls
- safety
- rock rescue
12 hours approx.
- climbing
- rappelling

XIII. Games of Low Organization:
- Stones
- Capture of the Flog
3 hours approx.
- Initiatives
- New Games

XIV. Health: (a) - First Aid Course
(St. John's Ambulance Elementary Course components)
- simulated injuries
- taught by R.N.
(b) - Food Diets: Menu planning, nutritional value of foods
18 hours approx.
(c) - Mental Health
(d) - Drug, Alcohol and Tobacco Abuse

The above subjects are taught on a formal basis by either the Registrered Nurse at Camp or the Outdoor Recreation Instructors. Practical application of all the above is made during the three week stay at the Camp.

XV. Camp Hygiene:

- proper clothing
- care of equipment
- sanitary practices for outdoor camping
- water purification
- sleeping habits and precautions
- safety
- kitchen clean-up and sanitary practices
- dorm clean-up and sanitary practices
- washroom clean-up and sanitary practices

The above is an ongoing program during the entire three week stay at the camp.

The program is an accelerated, compact experience which takes place over a three week period.

The hours quoted include mainly teaching hours and do not include all the time spent at each of the activities.

If the High School Principal will grant a credit to students who deserve it, at his grade level, it would enable a student to return to school with one credit and enable him to concentrate on subjects which have been excluded from our program.

APPENDIX O

Parents Written Response about A.C.T.I.O.N./Probation

APPENDIX O

Parental Responses to A.C.T.I.O.N. Program/Probation Supervision

I. "I believe in A.C.T.I.O.N. because it has helped ______ to grow up and it offered him the type of authority needed to settle down."

II. "...the program helped, and he now wants to do the five year stream in high school...before only looked to get out of school.... Feel the program is good for any boy, even boys who have not been in trouble."

III. "I feel the program for ______ was really good for him, he came home with respect and more love for what we do have to offer, instead of just taking things for granted. I really think other boys should be either made or talked into going. My other son was in trouble with and didn't go to A.C.T.I.O.N. I believe he could have used the discipline as well, or even more so."

IV. "He enjoyed attending the camp and came home feeling better about himself and his life but seems to be back in the same rut as before. We need year round things like this-run by people like the ones who were at "Camp ACTION".He thought they were great and hoped to maintain contact with them-but this hasn't happened-from either side, his or theirs."

V. "I feel that this program most certainly should be continued. It had a very positive effect on this teenager in regards to authority and outlook on life in general."

VI. "____ enjoyed himself very much during the summer. Yes, I think this is a very good course to have for other boys who need it or want to go and make good use of their time.... Thank you for letting ____ have the opportunity to take part in your program."

VII. "I have worked with a number of boys who have participated in the ACTION program. I strongly feel that this program should continue and that the length of the program be extended for some boys who may benefit from the increased exposure."

VIII. "____ went unwillingly to the camp by I think he did enjoy the experience and chance to do things he had never done before. I don't see any significant change in him, but I think he formed memories he will never forget and has gained some self-confidence. I think some boys would probably benefit from it."

APPENDIX O (continued)

IX. "I feel _____ really enjoyed the ACTION summer program. He seemed to be very happy when he returned home and more appreciative of his home and family. But, slowly, has given up with his school work. _____still has so many problems. I know my son has to work, and become more aware of this, before there will be really any improvement, especially with his school work."

X. "_____ improved a lot since attending camp and has grown up. It should be continued for other youths. He has learned more responsibility and is more sure of himself. He is trying really hard in school and doing his homework which he never did before."

XI. "I feel the ACTION program should be extended. The program proved to myself and _____ as a job well done. I feel ACTION should also be extended to programs in the community. This I believe will give them a feeling, of respect knowing they are part of a team."

NOTE:

Only two parents from control group (10%) commented on probation as being of any value while fifteen parents of the experimental group (71%) commented on A.C.T.I.O.N. as being of benefit for their son.